THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

JULY, 1930

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH AND THE WESTERN FRONTIER, 1789 TO 1830

ROY H. JOHNSON
Thiel College
Greenville, Pennsylvania

A SURVEY of the status of Lutheran churches at the close of the American Revolution is a prerequisite to a study of frontier expansion. The stronghold of Lutheranism in 1789 was Pennsylvania, the migration from the Palatinate during the early part of the century having brought large numbers of German Lutherans. It is estimated by Proud that the Germans and Swiss formed about one-third of the population of Pennsylvania in 1776,[1] and Professor A. R. Wentz offers the judgment that, at the outbreak of the Revolution, 75,000 of the 110,000 Germans in the colony were Lutheran.[2]

Only in the eastern section of the state were the Lutheran churches placed close enough together for practical cooperation. The minutes of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania contain numerous letters from ministers begging to be excused from the annual meeting because of the great distances they must travel. Others complain of having to serve congregations from fifty to one hundred miles apart. In the minutes for 1772 the following item appears:

1 Quoted by R. E. Chaddock, "Ohio Before 1850," in *Columbia Studies in Political Science* XXXI (New York, 1908), p. 220.

2 *The Lutheran Church in American History* (Philadelphia, 1923), p. 66.

Our country preacher, Mr. Schwab from Virginia, complained that he was getting older and weaker and was much troubled by far distant congregations in Virginia that he was expected to visit and serve fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty, to one hundred miles away but could not endure it. The Ministerium resolved that a letter be addressed to Peter Muhlenberg who lives only sixty miles away with the request that he go thither to investigate the circumstances and report on it.[3]

In 1797 Virginia, Maryland, and Western Pennsylvania were represented by regular ministerial delegates, and it was decided that the synodical meeting be held west of the Susquehanna once every three years.[4] There was also a scattered Lutheran constituency in North Carolina and South Carolina where many from the Palatinate had fled seeking refuge from Louis XIV. A party of Salzburgers founded Ebenezer, Georgia, in 1734, and spread throughout North Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee; other Lutheran and Moravian groups came later.[5] Before the National Period the southern sectarians were entirely dependent upon European missionary societies for religious sustenance. Southern Lutherans, though few in number, were aggressive in polity and wide in influence. G. D. Bernheim and G. H. Cox state that, in 1816, there were nine pastors, nine candidates, seven catechists, and about sixty congregations, numbering perhaps 6,000 members, in an area reaching from the Ohio River to the Gulf of Mexico and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mississippi River.[6] There was a considerable group of Lutheran congregations in New York which had been organized into a ministerium in 1786, but they do not come within the scope of the present study.

American Lutheranism was confronted with certain major problems at the close of the Revolution that must be considered, for they were projected into the frontier situations and helped bring

3 *Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States* (Philadelphia, 1918), p. 146.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 293.

5 G. D. Bernheim, *A History of German Settlements and the Lutheran Church in the Carolinas* (Philadelphia, 1872), pp. 1-160.

6 G. D. Bernheim and George H. Cox, *History of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod and Ministerium of North Carolina* (Philadelphia, 1902), p. 40.

about a cleavage between East and West. First, there was the matter of doctrinal position. The later Pietistic movement at Halle resulted in a swing away from confessional Lutheranism. In Pennsylvania there was merely indifference to doctrine; in New York, under the leadership of Frederick Henry Quitman, there was Universalism and outright rationalism.[7]

A natural concomitant of doctrinal looseness was a tendency toward the union of synods and of cooperation with other denominations. A scrutiny of the records of the Pennsylvania Ministerium reveals a broad spirit of comity. In 1762 and the years following, the Swedes participated in the convention program; after 1769 "the invited honorable members of the church council of the German Reformed congregation in Philadelphia were present."[8] Episcopal, Presbyterian, and English Baptist ministers assisted in the worship program at the convention, and, in 1781, the Ministerium heard a report on a "union with the so-called High Church."[9] Following 1790 the devotional meetings of the convention were held simultaneously in the Lutheran and Reformed churches, and, thirty years later, the two denominations began to exchange official delegates at their annual meetings.[10] In Berks County, Pennsylvania, a union church of Lutherans, Reformed and Mennonites was organized in 1767.[11] One of the objects of the *Evangelisches Magazin* which appeared in 1812 was the union of all German evangelical bodies.[12]

In the Carolinas unionistic tendencies were even stronger than in Pennsylvania. On the thirteenth day of November, 1787, the *Corpus Evangelicum* or *Unio Ecclesiastica* was organized in South Carolina composed of Lutheran and German Reformed ministers together with lay delegates from churches belonging to both denominations.[13]. A group of Lutheran ministers in North Caro-

7 H. E. Jacobs, *History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States* (New York, 1893), pp. 309 ff.

8 *Documentary History*, p. 105.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 178.

10 *Ibid.*

11 H. S. Kidd, *Lutherans in Berks County* (Reading, 1923), p. 159.

12 F. Bente, *American Lutheranism* (St. Louis, 1919), I, 102-3.

13 Bernheim, *op. cit.*, p. 338.

lina, in 1794, ordained Robert Miller, a licensed Methodist and a Scotchman, according to Episcopal rules, and he served Lutheran congregations for 27 years.[14] Reverend Shober, a member of the North Carolina Synod, made the following statement in 1816:

> I have attentively examined the doctrine of the Episcopalian church and read many excellent authors of the Episcopalians, know the Methodist doctrine from their book "Practice of Methodism" and am acquainted with the Baptist doctrine so far as they admit and admire Jesus as Saviour. Among all those classes who worship Jesus as a God, I see nothing of importance to prevent a cordial union.[15]

In Charleston, the Reverend Mr. Daser became pastor of a congregation, "consisting of Germans, originally belonging to three persuations, the Lutheran, Reformed, and Catholic."[16]

Throughout the period of this study the spirit of union continued unabated in the east and southeast. The famous *Plan-Entwurf* of 1818-20, resulting in the General Synod, was engineered by the Pennsylvania, New York, and North Carolina Synods. The tercentenary of the Reformation, in 1817, was, through the invitation of the Pennsylvania Ministerium, the occasion for an all-Protestant love feast (Moravians, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians).[17] The peak of the unionistic movement was reached in an overture for Christian union submitted, in 1838, by S. S. Schmucker, head of Gettysburg Seminary, after it had been favorably received by the Pennsylvania Ministerium. The plan called for cooperation through voluntary associations and recommended a free sacramental communion. It bore 42 signatures representing eleven denominational bodies.[18]

In contrast to these unionistic tendencies was the prevailing attitude on the language problem. The Pennsylvania German leaders had a strong racial consciousness, and they fought hard to

14 Jacobs, *op. cit.*, p. 319.

15 S. Henkel, *History of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod* (New Market, 1890), p. 210.

16 E. L. Hazelius, *History of the American Lutheran Church* (Zanesville, 1846), p. 118.

17 *Documentary History*, p. 506.

18 P. G. Mode, *Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History* (Menusha, 1921), p. 427.

keep the English language out of school and church. As late as 1811 the Pennsylvania Ministerium by resolution forbade English preaching except by consent of the church council and a majority of the members.[19] Many quarrels resulted from attempts to introduce English services.

The Lutheran churches were greatly handicapped in the early days by a shortage of ministers. At the time of H. M. Muhlenberg's death, 1787, there were only forty Lutheran ministers in America.[20] Jacobs estimates that, in the rural districts, each pastor had from six to twelve congregations, but still his major interest was the farm which he operated.[21] The frontier was hardest hit by the lack of trained leaders. From 1782 to 1806 there were never more than from one to three Lutheran pastors in the entire field of eastern Ohio and western Pennsylvania.[22] According to the report of the General Synod, 1823, the Lutheran churches in America numbered 900, the ministers 175.[23]

The great majority of the men who served the frontier congregations had not had the opportunity for a formal theological training although a few had studied in the German universities and others attended Princeton, Yale, or Frankfort College. Ordained pastors made a practice of tutoring candidates who later applied to the Ministerium and were accepted, first as catechists, and then as licensed preachers. The candidate was tested on his ability to write sermons and keep a diary. At each annual convention the the committees brought in their opinions of the sermons of the applicants. The report of the Pennsylvania Ministerium, 1811, is typical:

> Mr. Mensch's has our entire approval; we recommend him for ordination; Mr. Scriba's middling. Mr. D. Schaefer's inferior to even Scriba's disposition. Mr. Hect's middling and dry, adorned with poetic flights; Miller's good, thorough, edifying; Bael's good and from the heart, but full of Anglicisms; Schaefer's good if he had another text than Noah's dove. Mr. Heim's simple, but from the heart, full, however of orthographic errors.

19 *Documentary History*, p. 448.
20 Wentz, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
21 Jacobs, *op. cit.*, p. 325.
22 E. B. Burgess, *Memorial History of Pittsburgh Synod* (Greenville, 1925), p. 57.
23 Bente, *op. cit.*, I, 95.

Engel's good, but it is doubtful whether he wrote it. Sackman is a useful man and his sermon is full of common sense. Mr. Colson's sermon is better than his printed ones which he brought along from Europe, and have very little that is Christian in them.[24]

Important as these problems were, there was another of equal importance, that of provision for growth and expansion. The process of extension induced internal disruption and outward change. By 1830 there were nine synodical bodies instead of two, as in 1787, and East and West were hopelessly at loggerheads.[25]

First, let us follow the Germans in their journeys westward. Early marriage and constant migration the patriarch Muhlenberg found to be the characteristic Lutheran traits:

> I have noticed that within the five years of my being here, hardly half of the original members of my congregations in the country remain. Of the half, some have died, but for the most part they have gone away forty to one hundred English miles to the boundaries of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia.[26]

Wherever the German Lutherans went they felt drawn together by a common heritage of language, culture, and religion. Congregations were formed and churches erected years before there was any prospect of a regularly conducted service of worship. Every year letters were received by the various synods from these isolated centers of the faith asking for trained leaders. Such letters form almost the only reliable data available for the tracing of Lutheran expansion. For example, the first intimation that there were Lutherans in Illinois came in the form of an urgent call to the North Carolina Synod from Union County, Illinois, 1825, signed by 43 persons asking for a pastor or missionary who would be able "to preach in the German and English languages and establish schools and labor for the welfare of the church."[27]

As early as 1768 the Pennsylvania Ministerium received requests for aid from six small congregations on the frontier of Maryland and Pennsylvania (names not given). There is not

24 *Documentary History*, p. 433.

25 R. Fortenbaugh, *Development of Synodical Polity in the Lutheran Church in America to 1829* (Philadelphia, 1926), p. 63.

26 Jacobs, *op. cit.*, p. 363.

27 Bernheim, *op. cit.*, p. 471.

space to list the calls that came during the next sixty years from groups scattered throughout the West. Some of the petitioning congregations had already erected church edifices; others, less fortunate, suggested that the courthouse be used for the service. A very few offered to pay the travelling expenses of the home missionary. Everywhere there was evidence that Lutherans in a strange environment wished for the protection and assurance afforded by the old religious controls.

The main stream of German pioneers followed the valleys to the south and entered Maryland, western Virginia, and Kentucky in large numbers. There they mingled with the Scotch-Irish to form the back country population. In 1787 four of the German settlements in western Pennsylvaia petitioned the Ministerium of Pennsylvania for Lutheran pastors. According to the synodical records these congregations were situated toward Pittsburgh, Redstone being the chief place. They owned 300 acres of good land but were in need of a man who was strong and could ride, for they were scattered.[28]

Kentucky seemingly had few attractions for Lutherans, and they passed on into Ohio. Lewis Collins mentions in detail the work of Baptists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, but does not say a word about Lutherans in Kentucky.[29] A careful gleaning of synodical records, however, shows here and there Lutheran beginnings in Kentucky. The minutes of the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1790 have this important entry:

> Dr. Muhlenberg reported to the synod that in the summer of last year a man named Mace, who for some years had been a schoolmaster in Pennsylvania, had through diligent study acquired a fair knowledge of theology, and at present lives in Kentucky, had asked him for a license which he, after a closer examination of his abilities, had granted him. The Dr. hoped that partly the remoteness of the field and the fact that it was entirely without German preachers, and partly the inconvenience of calling a synod without loss of time might sufficiently justify his action.[30]

A few years later Ludwig Rausch and other German Lu-

28 *Documentary History,* p. 178.
29 Lewis Collins, *Historical Sketches of Kentucky* (Cincinnati, 1847), *passim.*
30 *Documentary History,* p. 231.

therans settled in Boone County,[31] and a number of Lutherans from Nelson County petitioned the Ministerium, 1816, for a preacher who could use the English language. Johannes Stauch, Paul Henkel, and other travelling preachers visited Kentucky congregations when going to and from their main fields of operation in Ohio and Indiana. After 1818 Kentucky was disputed territory for four competing synods, the North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Tennessee, and the resultant confusion greatly hampered Lutheranism in that state.

It was Ohio that became the permanent home of the major portion of the Pennsylvania German exodus. In 1850 Ohio had a population of 1,980,329. Pennsylvania had furnished over 200,000, more than twice as many as any other state.[32] Prior to 1830, the limit set by this study, the Germans in the west had come mainly from the eastern states. The great tide of immigration from Germany did not begin until the following decade.

Lutherans as early as 1810 were in Harmon County, Indiana, in Union County, Illinois, by 1817, and in Wayne, Madison, and Perry Counties in Missouri about the same time. By 1835 there were Lutherans in twenty Indiana counties.[33] The North Carolina Synod had to reach far to care for its wandering children. By 1811 it had congregations in Sullivan, Green, Blount, and Knox counties in Tennessee, and five years later Fairfield County, Ohio, Washington County, Indiana, Union County, Illinois, and Cape Girardeau, Missouri, were being served.[34]

Another line of migratory advance was of importance. After the Louisiana Purchase, 1803, many Germans sold their possessions in North Carolina and Virginia and moved to Kentucky, Tennessee and the southwest. In April, 1812, the North Carolina Synod admitted nine congregations in Tennessee, and eight years later the Tennessee Synod was formed.[35] The new organization

31 A. B. Faust, *The German Element in the United States* (New York, 1909), I, 381.

32 Chaddock, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

33 M. L. Wagner, *The Chicago Synod and Its Antecedents* (Waverly, Iowa, 1909), p. 9.

34 Bernheim and Cox, *op. cit., passim.*

35 Faust, *op. cit.*, I, 338-9.

soon extended its work into Virginia, Indiana, Missouri, South Carolina, and Alabama.

Under the pressure of frontier needs the Lutheran synods developed a technique for the care of congregations in newly settled territory. The backbone of the system was the travelling preacher. These were of two kinds, (1) the free lance, and (2) the regularly commissioned representative of the synod.

The pioneer emissaries of Lutheranism to the frontier were for the most part self-educated, unsalaried, unordained, and independent preachers of the gospel. The shortage of trained pastors made it inevitable that such a type should appear. According to Jacobs, the only force that induced the ministers to attend synodical meetings was the sharing of the proceeds of certain European legacies that were annually distributed, and, later, he compares both German and Reformed pastors with feudal lords.[36] Johannes Stauch, one of the early missionaries, educated himself in his cabin. Reverend Scherer, on a tour through Virginia in 1811, found an unordained pastor administering the sacraments to six cogregations of from 25 to 30 families each.[37] He found many farmer preachers.

The communion service was a vital part of the religious life of the pioneer Lutherans, and, if there were no regularly ordained ministers accessible, a makeshift had to be found. This explains a petition from Fairfield, Ohio, and Washington County, Indiana, 1816, requesting that ministers visit them to administer the Holy Sacraments, or to have certain lay readers examined and licensed so as to "labor in holy things" among them.[38]

The unorganized roaming on the frontier by the free lance preacher was wholly inadequate to meet Lutheran needs. Many of these men were moral reprobates and drunkards, and nearly all were ignorant of Lutheran doctrine and policy. The Ministerium of Pennsylvania early saw the need for a change but for years

36 Jacobs, *op. cit.*, pp. 325-6.
37 Bernheim, *op. cit.*, p. 378.
38 Bernheim and Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

could offer no solution. The following item from the 1780 convention is typical of others:

> New Goschenhoppe is too far away and the road too dangerous; the mountain congregation is too small and is at present supplied by a vagabond who claims to be a preacher; and this congregation alone could not well support a preacher in the present times and circumstances.[39]

In 1804 the Ministerium came to an important decision regarding frontier polity; it was decided to send out travelling missionaries. These men were to be appointed by each annual convention and were to report orally on their activities at the next yearly meeting. The plan had the dual purpose of gathering scattered Lutherans into congregations and of serving widely distributed frontier groups already organized. The details of the plan were perfected the following year:

> It was moved and agreed to appoint travelling preachers who shall make a tour each year.
>
> Resolved, that forty dollars a month be allowed each travelling preacher and that one month's salary be paid in advance.
>
> Resolved, that one district for a travelling preacher shall be the circuit from the so-called head of the Holston in Virginia to Knoxville in the state of Tennessee.
>
> Moved, that a travelling preacher be named for the district called New Pennsylvania (in the state of Ohio) from the capital, New Madrid, to Lake Erie.
>
> Resolved, that the visiting preachers be furnished with letters of recommendation to the congregations by the President and Secretary, and be provided with written instructions.[40]

From 1805 until the formation of the General Synod, 1820, the Ministerium each year heard the reports of the travelling emissaries, allowed their salaries, made appointments for the ensuing year and ordered digests of their reports printed and distributed among the congregations. These reports are disappointing in that they do not give an itinerary or statistics concerning the number of congregations visited or the total membership. According to the journal handed in by Professor Stauch, 1807, it appears that he travelled 1300 miles, preached 67 times, baptized 212 children,

39 *Documentary History*, p. 159.
40 *Documentary History*, p. 367.

and received on the journey $42.98. He travelled about 122 days, and, in consideration of this, the Synodical Treasurer owed to Mr. Stauch the sum of $162.67.[41]

The travelling preachers continued to receive excellent treatment from the Pennsylvania Ministerium. Their tours were not to consume more than three months, and, according to the records, the stipend of $40 a month was paid regularly. After 1807 a fund was created for the support of travelling preachers and preachers' widows. There was usually a balance in the treasury.[42]

The North Carolina Synod, which was organized in 1803, began to send out travelling missionaries seven years later, the men being appointed annually and the synod pledged to support them. As there were not enough ministers to permit some to be assigned to full time work on the mission field, the local preacher dropped his work for a part of the year and served on the frontier. They made annual reports to the Synod, *Reiseprediger,* extracts from which have been published by Bernheim and Cox in their *History of the North Carolina Synod.*[43]

From their diaries a fairly adequate picture of the type of work done by these pioneer travelling preachers can be reconstructed. Paul Henkel's journal, Johannes Stauch's autobiography, and the journals of Jacob Scherer and Robert Miller are available in translation. Henkel travelled in a two-wheeled cart; Stauch, Miller, and Scherer rode horseback. Henkel and Stauch were at first without training, ordination or commission. The latter relates how, after the call to preach came to him in a dream, the opportunity came to practice the new calling:

> In a short time I was invited to Morgantown to commence my ministerial life. I went without any synodical authority, being of God after the order of Melchisedec, and ministered to them once every four weeks. I was soon pressingly solicited to preach for a few Germans in Fayette County, Pa., twenty miles farther West, and in all seventy miles from home. Thus the field continued to increase, the poor Germans hungering for the bread of life. The cry was continually, "Come West" or "Come over and help us."[44]

41 *Ibid.,* p. 371.
42 *Ibid.,* p. 387.
43 *Loc. cit.*
44 Burgess, *op. cit.,* p. 32.

Preaching services were conducted whenever and wherever there was opportunity. If there was no Lutheran church a settler's cabin, the county courthouse, or a church of another denomination was utilized. When preaching in a non-Lutheran church there were always two sermons, one in German and the other in English. Both Henkel and Stauch were averse to preaching in English, the former once exclaiming to a mixed group, "Oh perverse people! If you are invited you will not come, and now we are over-run with you. Nevertheless I must preach to you too, so as to get room to instruct the young."[45]

The early missionaries were motivated by denominational, cultural, and racial loyalties. Henkel cruised through Ohio seeking out the Germans, going from cabin to cabin, and listing them carefully, letting the news of others farther on shape his itinerary. Lutheran leaders faced the stark fear that their scattered adherents would be absorbed by other stronger denominations. Hence the travelling preacher. At first he came on his own initiative; later he was sent out by the synod. His business was to hold the brethren in the faith until a permanent pastor came.

In the early days the relations between Lutherans and members of other denominations on the frontier were generally friendly. Henkel frequently spoke of baptizing children for those whom he indiscriminately termed "the English," although it is true that he called Baptist and Methodist preachers fanatics and once arranged for a formal debate with a Baptist.[46] The spirit of interdenominational cooperation which was so characteristic of the Pennsylvania, New York, and North Carolina synods did not obtain in the west. In fact, an aversion to the unionistic tendencies in the east was a contributing cause to the forming of the Tennessee and Ohio Synods.

One reason for the exclusiveness of Lutheran congregations on the frontier was resentment of the proselyting activities of Baptists and Methodists. The latter were usually first on the ground

45 C. L. Martzloff, "Paul Henkel's Journal" in *Ohio Archeological and Historical Publications* (Columbus, 1914), XXIII, 162-218.

46 *Ibid.*, pp. 196, 199.

and ready to swell their ranks. Rev. Scherer entered in his diary as he neared Marietta, Ohio, 1813, on a mission for the North Carolina Synod, "Proselyting is carried on extensively here, and some of the Germans have united themselves with the Baptists and Methodists, but very few heathens have become Christians."[47]

The Methodists were especially eager to win over the Germans. Adam Miller, a Methodist pastor, wrote a letter in 1835 to Reverend A. T. Morris, editor of the *Western Christian Advocate,* seeking aid in learning German as the Germans were "scattered all over the country like sheep without a shepherd."[48] Several Lutheran pastors were converted to Methodism. It is only natural that the Lutherans should begin to retaliate by means of polemical preaching. John Plank, who came to Ohio from Hesse-Darmstadt in 1829, wrote, "When I began to understand English I heard of the Methodists, but I heard only slanderous reports concerning them from the enemies of the church. Yet I believed these reports, and I was filled with opposition to Methodism."[49]

One of the Lutheran purveyors of invective was pastor Johannes Schweizerbarth who worked in Butler County, Pennsylvania, after 1820. The following is an account of a sermon preached at the courthouse in Greensburg before a crowd of Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Lutherans:

> There are only three cases of immersion recorded in the scriptures: the antediluvians, Pharaoh and his army, and the swine of the Gadarenes .... You Presbyterians, your doctrine of predestination takes away the meaning of baptism. The sacrament brings no grace to you if predestination be true..... You Methodists sometimes baptize your children and sometimes you don't. You get up an excitement, get them anxious and bench them. Then, if you forgot to baptize them, you call a meeting to initiate members, sprinkle, affuse, or immerse them as they may choose, and then watch them for six months to see if they are Christians.[50]

One can readily imagine that the rank and file of Lutheran adherents were not sympathetic toward other Protestant churches.

47 Bernheim, *op. cit.,* p. 389.

48 A. Miller, *Experience of German Methodist Preachers* (Cincinnati, 1859), pp. 63, 64.

49 *Ibid.,* p. 239.

50 Burgess, *op. cit.,* p. 61.

J. Bier, a Methodist minister, took keen delight in recounting the story of a young member of the Lutheran Church in Sandusky, Ohio, who stated that he would not go to the Methodist meetings, nor would he be converted till "the trees in the forest had turned upside down; that is, stuck their tops into the ground and reared their roots aloft."[51]

Despite the concern of other denominations for the salvation of Lutheran souls, the evidence indicates that the German Lutherans lived on rather a high moral plane. It must be remembered that only a part of the German immigrants were Lutherans. Rationalism was widespread among the Germans, and drunken brawling, blasphemy, and railing at religion were only too common. A few of these rationalists set themselves up as preachers in Lutheran and Reformed churches and exercised in general a degrading influence.[52] Johannes Stauch condemned Ohio Lutherans for the typical frontier sins of drinking, harvesting and hunting on the Sabbath, dancing, and boisterous conduct in church. However, he ended his diary by a peroration on the fine treatment he received and the excellent character of the German pioneers.[53]

At the beginning of the National Period the Lutheran churches were strongly committed to the use of the German language. One might naturally expect that, on the frontier, the process of Americanization would lead to the rapid introduction of English. Such a generalization is not true. Where the Lutherans were few and widely scattered the need for English services to avert annihilation was felt. Wherever frontier Lutherans were strong enough to form schools and communities, as was the case in Ohio, Tennessee, Indiana, and Illinois, the demand for German services was voiced by those in authority.

R. J. Miller, a travelling preacher from North Carolina, recorded in his diary the account of a service at Cove Creek, Kentucky, October 11, 1803. There were a few old Germans, but youth had learned to speak English. If a teacher spoke German

51 Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 221.
52 Wagner, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
53 Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

to the latter, it was to them "like the sound of a church bell."[54] In 1806 Paul Henkel made an extended journey through western Pennsylvania and Ohio. His policy was to preach in both German and English. The English sermon which always followed the German was for non-Lutherans, but at Clear Creek he found that his English sermon received the greater approbation from both the Germans and the English. Near Chillicothe he learned that the German inhabitants of the place were prejudiced against the German pastors. This attitude, he believed, was the result of "stupid pride and light-mindedness."[55]

As the German Lutherans became more firmly established the resistance to Americanization grew apace. The Ohio Conference, 1816, made it the duty of every pastor to encourage his congregations as much as possible to establish German schools, and required every minister, at least once a year, to deliver a sermon in all his congregations of which the chief contents were to be "the great need of supporting and promoting German schools." Burgess has taken sharp issue with the statement of Theodore Roosevelt in *The Winning of the West* that the Germans who settled west of the mountains were quickly Americanized. The former has pointed out that, although this may have been true of scattered families in Kentucky and Tennessee, it certainly did not apply to western Pennsylvania and Ohio.[56] *Der Deutsche Pioneer* contains a number of excellent accounts of how the Germans settled in groups throughout Ohio. Working together they built houses, schools, churches, and shops, and strove to preserve their German heritage and culture.[57]

No account of frontier churches can be complete without a consideration of the relations between Lutherans and German Reformed groups. The members of the two denominations were drawn together by a common language, culture, and economic need. Intermarriage, the problem of defense against aggrandizement by

54 Faust, *op. cit.*, I, 386.
55 Martzloff, *op. cit.*, p. 194.
56 Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
57 *Der Deutsche Pioneer* (Cincinnati), III (1871), 22.

Methodists and Baptists, movements in Germany prior to the Prussian Union of 1817, and the need for political strength to oppose Anglo-Americans were also factors.

There was a sharing of pastors, church buildings, and school teachers. The Reformed church was the weaker of the two bodies; in 1812 it had a total of less than 40 ministers, all located in the east. A single missionary was sent to Ohio in 1814 and 1816, but he did not locate there.[58] The United Brethren movement cut deeply into the ranks of the German Reformed. The result was that the liaison with the Lutherans usually terminated in the loss of autonomy on the part of the German Reformed.

E. B. Burgess states, concerning the relations between Reformed and Lutherans in the region about Pittsburgh in pioneer days, that "neither body attempted to build a church without the help of the other for nearly half a century after the first settlements were made. In some settlements one of the denominations might be too weak to give much assistance in the work of building, but both were given the same rights in the church."[59] In western Pennsylvania the deacons, elders, and trustees were equal number from the Lutheran and Reformed groups. Collections, expenditures, and the power of excommunication were shared. In one instance the Reformed members posted a forfeit of 50 pounds guaranteeing to let no free-lance preacher (of whom they were cursed with a greater number than the Lutherans) occupy the pulpit.[60]

The Ohio Conference churches were union congregations. When the German Reformed and Lutherans of Stone Creek, Tuscarawas County, decided, in 1815, to build a hewed-log church "there was subscribed to the erection $287 besides $24.75 in labor at the rate of fifty cents per day without boarding and $55.50 for stove and stove pipe."[61] Wagner calls attention to a union church erected at Georgetown (Germantown) Wayne County, Indiana, in 1822. Here the German Reformed assisted in the erection of

58 A. B. Koplin, "History of Missions of the Reformed Church" in *Reformed Quarterly Review,* XXVIII, 330.

59 Burgess, *op. cit.,* p. 40.

60 *Ibid.,* p. 41.

61 P. H. Buehring, *Beginnings of Lutheranism in Ohio* (Master's Thesis, University of Chicago, 1923), p. 30. Cf. *Der Deutsche Pioneer,* III (May 1871), 87.

the church and were given its use every alternate Sunday, but they had no title to the realty. The Reformed element became extinct in about twenty years.[62]

In Tennessee, where the Reformed were very few in numbers, the formal type of merger agreement was rarely necessary. The spirit of fellowship was strong, however, and the secretary of the Tennessee Synod was instructed to send copies of the minutes of the sessions to the German Reformed Synod of Pennsylvania, the East Pennsylvania Synod and the Ohio Synod.[63] After 1840 an ever increasing denominational zeal caused the Tennessee and Ohio synods to look with disfavor upon fraternization with the German Reformed and revert to historic Lutheranism.

Both in the type of church building that they erected and in their form of service the Lutherans differed somewhat from their Protestant neighbors of other faiths. As has been stated, the first thought of Lutheran pioneers, when settling permanently, was to form a congregation and then build a church. Although such travelling missionaries as Stauch, Henkel, Foster, and Miller often had to preach in courthouses, cabins, and in available Protestant churches, such conditions were only temporary.

The Lutheran churches on the frontier were usually two story affairs built of logs. Following is a description of Zion Church which was built in 1820 in Thorn township, Perry County, Ohio:

> It stood in the S. W. corner of the cemetery, and was about 34 by 36 feet and about 18 feet high.
>
> This building had two entrances, one on the southeast side for the women and the other on the northeast side for the men. The pulpit was to the northwest. From the ladies' entrance there was an aisle leading directly to the altar. The younger women occupied the seats to the right and left of this aisle. At the sides of the pulpit the seats stood lengthwise. The older women occupied those to the right. The church officers occupied the first seats on the left, and those in the rear of them were occupied by the older men. At the men's entrance, immediately to the left, was the stairway to the gallery. This gallery was on three sides of the building. This was occupied by the younger men and the choir. The stove stood nearly in the center, at

62 Wagner, *op. cit.*, p. 20.
63 Henkel, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

the end of the aisle of the ladies' entrance. At first it had no floor or pews, and the worshippers sat on the sleepers with their feet on the ground, while a carpenter's work-bench served as a pulpit.[64]

In most instances a school house and a stable occupied corners of the church yard. The western Pennsylvania churches of the early days were built of logs with puncheon floors, having but one door. The altar was a rude table, and "the pulpit was always of the high wine glass pattern and was sometimes placed to one side and sometimes against the wall above the altar."[65]

With each pastor assigned to so many congregations and preaching places services could only be held monthly or, in favored places, bi-weekly. There was little ritual before 1830, for the Pennsylvania Germans came from the Palatinate where the liturgy was frowned upon. As there were few organs the pastor often had to line out the hymns and lead the singing. The sacramental vessels were of the simplest kind, an ordinary dish or bowl serving as a baptismal font and the wine for communion being contained in a bottle or jug and distributed in an ordinary tumbler.[66]

The German Lutherans were committed to the development of an educational program. A German school was either built on the church yard or the church served the purpose, and the school teacher was accorded equal rank with the pastor. Thus the German language and culture were perpetuated. Reports concerning schools were made at every meeting of the Pennsylvania Ministerium. The pastors fought hard against the encroachment of English, but were not always successful. For example, at the 1790 convention Mr. King reported that in Friedrichstadt there was a German school with 40 to 50 children, and in his country congregations several smaller schools; but he complained that many parents preferred to send their children to English schools. Mr. Lehman reported eight schools in his congregation, several being held in common with the Reformed. Mr. Melsheimer's

64 Buehring, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
65 Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
66 Buehring, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

field had only one German school, and the tendency toward English was very strong.[67]

As Paul Henkel travelled on the frontier he noted with satisfaction the progress that had been made in founding German schools:

> From New Market to the Genesis Gap in Augusta County is 50 miles. There are many German schools and churches which are always cared for . . . . . about Lewisburg there are several German congregations but which have built no church, but they have German schools . . . . . In Grayham station 18 miles up the Ohio is a little German congregation, but they formerly had a good German school. The schoolmaster was an excellent man and a good singer, and did the young people much good, in that he gave them good instruction in the same.[68]

Toward the development of higher institutions of learning not much was accomplished before 1830. Franklin College at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, was incorporated, 1787, as a joint project with the German Reformed Synod, but efforts to introduce theological instruction failed, and the school was reduced to the status of a local academy. A small seminary established at Hartwick, New York, 1815, was not supported by many Lutherans outside that state. The most successful institution of higher learning in the East was Gettysburg Seminary, founded in 1826.

Western leaders early saw the need for institutions of higher learning. A Lutheran seminary on a small scale was begun in Greene County, Tennessee, 1817, under the supervision of Philip Henkel and J. E. Bell. The seminary appears to have been a private undertaking with Bell the principal teacher and Henkel the field agent. The curriculum included theology, Greek, Latin, German and English. At first the North Carolina Synod received the project with favor, expressing the hope that the "small beginning, by the help of God, located in so healthy and cheap a region of the country," might prosper in such a manner that many well qualified ministers and missionaries might "be educated as preachers of the glorious gospel of Jesus in all parts of the

67 *Documentary History*, p. 178.
68 Martzloff, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

world."[70] However, the schism of 1819 ruined all hope of success, and the seminary died shortly afterward.

The subject of founding a seminary was often discussed by the Ohio Synod during the first ten years after its founding in 1818. The seminary opened its doors in 1830 at Canton, Ohio, the reason for the location being the fact that the pastor who had been elected theological professor by the Synod had five congregations in that vicinity.[71] The next year it was moved to Columbus, Ohio. The Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina began operations February, 1831, at Newberry Courthouse. The sole member of the faculty, Rev. John G. Schwartz, died that same summer, and operations were suspended for two years, "no provision having been made for so unexpected an occurrence."[72]

A distrust of the liberal doctrines subscribed to by many eastern Lutherans led western leaders to see the need for a separate system of ministerial education. The Ohio Synod, in rejecting the invitation to cooperate with the seminary at Hartwick, New York, stated that it was the desire of the church in the West to have a theological institution "within her own borders, where her interests might generally concentrate, and from which as a fountain-head the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession of Faith might be promulgated literally, purely, unadulteratedly, ... and where the characteristics of Lutheranism, which neither malice nor art can destroy, nor time efface, might be preserved."[73]

As has been indicated, the German Lutherans resisted racial, cultural, and denominational amalgamation on the frontier. Quite naturally they had little sympathy with the religious revivals that characterized other Protestant efforts in the West. When the revival was at its height, 1800-1801, the Lutheran frontier was in North Carolina, western Virginia, and western Pennsylvania. The North Carolina leaders were greatly impressed by the revival

70 Bernheim and Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 64; *Minutes N. C. Synod for 1817*, p. 11.
71 Jacobs, *op. cit.*, p. 391.
72 Hazelius, *op. cit.*, p. 291.
73 Buehring, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-56.

phenomena, and, while they refused to give a direct endorsement, it was not officially condemned.[74]

In western Pennsylvania several Lutheran pastors held protracted revival meetings, 1802, and a schism resulted. There were three characteristic reactions to revival tactics: conversion, fear and awe, and indignant protest. A statement from Johannes Stauch illustrates this:

> During the meeting (1802), which continued for one week, some twenty persons fell in their seats while others left their seats and hurried out of the house, some with indignation and others with fear. The falling or jerking as it was called was a strange phenomenon indeed ..... the results of these exercises and this protracted meeting lead to powerful diversions of congregations. For a number of persons and a number of congregations shortly after this separated themselves from the church and employed a Rev. Kittlebough to preach at M. G. Riffles in sight of my meeting house at the same hour that I preached in the church.[75]

Later on Lutheran bodies farther west formally condemned the revival. In 1818 the Ohio Special Conference issued a long "Memorial" defining true Lutheranism. It rejected revivals, protracted meetings, the "New Light" and direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit and emphasized conscientious instruction of the young and careful preaching of the Word.[76]

A statement is in order concerning synodical development, 1787-1820, as the frontier was one of the contributing factors to the forming of new synods. The Pennsylvania Ministerium and the New York Synod are the so-called "mother synods"; the former began to function in 1748 and the latter in 1786. Both groups were exponents of liberal Lutheranism and were on friendly terms prior to 1820. The North Carolina Synod was organized in 1803 for the simple reason that the Pennsylvania Ministerium had never extended its jurisdiction farther south than Virginia. With the disbanding of the Helmstaedt Mission Society[77] a southern organi-

74 Bernheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 352 ff.
75 Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
76 Buehring, *op. cit.*, p. 61.
77 Bernheim, *op. cit.*, p. 355.

zation became necessary. The new synod entertained an attitude of cordial fellowship toward the two older bodies.

The formation of the Ohio Synod, 1818, was the first expression of sectional consciousness on the part of Lutheran leaders. With the permission of the Pennsylvania Ministerium a series of special conferences had been held by Ohio Lutherans, 1812-1818. This western group yearly asked for and received further powers of autonomy. Finally they demanded the right to ordain ministers and, failing to get it, formed an independent synod.

The new organization showed an aversion to the liberal doctrines of the East. It refused to join the General Synod, because the merger was inimical to synodical independence. Wentz states that the Ohio Synod feared a hierarchical trend and the possible prevalence of the English language.[78] As the years passed the Ohio Synod became more and more conservative in doctrine. It sent out travelling preachers into Ohio, western Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois thus encroaching upon territory claimed by other synods.

The German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Tennessee was organized, 1818-1820, by a group of frontier preachers headed by David and Paul Henkel. As Ferm has pointed out, "this event may be taken as the first organized effort to bring the Lutheran Church back to a confessional consciousness since the days of the Patriarch."[79]

The beginnings of the Tennessee Synod were shrouded in bitter controversy. The Rev. David Henkel, accused of teaching doctrines contrary to the position of the church, defended himself by producing a Latin copy of the Book of Concord. The frontiersmen showed their group loyalty by holding a rump convention at which Philip Henkel ordained his brother David and a certain J. E. Bell under an oak tree in open defiance of the North Carolina Synod. The Tennessee Synod was formed the following year, 1820. Its two cardinal tenets were the exclusive use of the German language and the unaltered Augsburg Confession.[80] The

78 *Op. cit.*, p. 107.
79 V. Ferm, *The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology* (New York, 1927), p. 64.
80 S. Henkel, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

work prospered and was extended into North Carolina, Virginia, Indiana, Missouri, South Carolina, and Alabama.

Working as it did in a backwoods country the Tennessee Synod developed distinctive traits. Its constitution, 1820, contained an arraignment of the Methodist doctrine of conversion and the practice, at revival meetings, of straining "every power of body and soul in crying and screaming to move the Holy Spirit."[81] The fear of synodical tyranny over the individual congregation is revealed in the clause forbidding the Synod to be incorporated by the civil government or to have an incorporated theological seminary under its care. The dangers of an incorporated church with a treasury were that it could loan money out at usury, disposses widows and orphans, get a monopoly on the sale of Bibles, and educate unfit thousands for the ministry.[82] Salaries for missionaries were deemed improper in the light of Mt. 6:33-34, and funds for widows and orphans of ministers were condemned as implying that the families of ministers were "a nobler race than other people, so that extraordinary provisions must be made for them in preference to others."[83]

The organization of the Synod of Maryland and Virginia, 1820, was accomplished with the full cooperation of the Pennsylvania Ministerium, in order that Lutheran work might effectively be extended into new territory. The new synod was active in enlarging its boundaries and, 1828, formed the "Parent Domestic Missionary and Education Society of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Maryland and Virginia", the first organization of its kind among Lutherans.[84] The divisive tendency was again operative in 1825 when the West Pennsylvania Synod was formed at Green Castle. The reasons for the forming of the synod were evident in the protocol:

1. That our future conventions will be less expensive to us and to our congregations because we will not have to travel so far to synod.

81 F. Bente, *op. cit.*, I, 209.
82 *Ibid.*, p. 226.
83 *Ibid.*, p. 228.
84 A. R. Wentz, *History of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Maryland* (Harrisburg, 1920), p. 105.

2. That we can convene at more places and thus be useful to more congregations, where at present, the body, large as it is, cannot be accommodated.[85]

In the attempt to summarize the denominational and social aspects of frontier Lutheranism the spirit of independence and rebellion against the authority of mother synods that led to schism and the forming of new organizations must be considered. A scrutiny of the records of the Pennsylvania Ministerium from 1805 to 1818 shows that the Ohio ministers would not cross the mountains to meet with the Synod. Year after year they were excused and the bond of comity grew weaker even though the policy of the Pennsylvania Ministerium was conciliatory. The brethren in Ohio would not be placated, for their thought patterns, social attitudes, and religious concepts developed on the frontier were different from their eastern compatriots. The fact that the synodical conventions met annually helped alienate the westerners, as it was impractical for ministerial and lay delegates to make each year a long journey over the mountains. Thus they lost their voice in shaping polity, grew indifferent, and then set up inndependent organizations.

85 A. Stump and H. Anstadt, *History of the Evangelical Synod of West Pennsylvania* (Chambersburg, 1925), p. 82.

THE LANGUAGE PROBLEM IN THE SWEDISH CHURCHES ON THE DELAWARE

ARMIN G. WENG
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The language problem in the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania dates back at least as far as 1690, when Jacob Fabritius was pastor of the Swedish Lutheran congregation at Wicaco (Philadelphia) and Tinicum, in what had been the Swedish colony on the Delaware, but since 1655 was under the control of England. The church was losing its hold upon the young people. One important cause for this was the fact that Swedish was still the prevalent language, but the pastor could speak Dutch much better than Swedish, and thus could not hold the young people.[1] His successor, Andrew Rudman, a candidate for the degree of Ph.D., when he had retired from the active ministry due to ill health, supplied at Christ Church (Church of England) in 1707.[2] Here was the beginning of the transition which led the Swedish Lutheran church in America to the use of the English language, and eventually to absorption by the Protestant Episcopal church.

The Swedish church in America was in many respects like the English church in the colonies. It used a liturgy which had much in common with that of the Church of England.[3] The Augsburg Confession was the prototype of the Thirty-nine Articles.[4]

The Swedish church was a national church, like the Church of England. The king of Sweden was to the Swedish settlers and

1 Henry Eyster Jacobs, *A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States* (New York, 1893), p. 87.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 94. Israel Acrelius, "History of New Sweden or the Settlements on the River Delaware," translated by W. M. Reynolds in Vol. XI of *Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania* (1874), p. 197. A. L. Graebner, *Geschichte der Lutherischen Kirche in America* (St. Louis, 1882), p. 79.

3 Henry Eyster Jacobs, *The Lutheran Movement in England* (Philadelphia, 1890), p. 224.

4 G. W. Sandt, "Early Lutheran Footprints on American Soil," in *The Lutheran* (Philadelphia, July 1, 1926), p. 11.

their descendants what the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London was to the English. The Swedish church in the colonies was simply an outlying station. The same was true of the English church.[5] The Swedish church maintained the apostolic succession, although it did not stress it. Consequently, ordination was only to be performed by a bishop or at his specific direction. The English church, laying greater stress upon the apostolic succession, permitted no ordination except by the bishop.[6] The Swedish church never sent a bishop to this country, nor did the Church of England.[7] One of the Swedish pastors was appointed provost, or superintendent of the churches in America.[8] The powers of the provost were as limited as were those of the commissary, who represented in America the Bishop of London.[9] The provost acted simply as the representative of the authorities in Sweden, and, in spite of the fact that a year was required to receive an answer from across the Atlantic concerning a matter reported, the provost had to wait for instructions, and could not act on his own initiative.[10] To the rule that pastors could be ordained only by bishops, three exceptions were made when the Swedish authorities deemed their episcopal sanction for ordination sufficient, and directed that candidates be ordained by the provost and his brother ministers, or, in one case, by the pastor in London.[11] Young men who were sent as pastors to America considered the appointment merely as a preparation for higher places at home. The members of the churches, conceiving of the church in national terms, did not consider it their duty to support the pastor or to keep the property in repair. They preferred to sell sections of their land, as needed, rather than supply the wants of their pastors in a regular and systematic way. Oftentimes the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts contributed to their support when the

5 Henry Eyster Jacobs, *The Lutherans*, p. 104.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 78.

7 George Hodges, *Three Hundred Years of the Episcopal Church in America* (Philadelphia, 1906), p. 47.

8 Jacobs, *The Lutherans*, p. 105.

9 Leonard Woolsey Bacon, *A History of American Christianity* (New York, 1897), p. 52.

10 Jacobs, *The Lutherans*, p. 106.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 106.

Swedish pastors also cared for the needs of English colonists.[12] A few of the more devoted pastors made real sacrifices for their people. Others, as their families grew, felt constrained to petition for charges in Sweden. Whatever schools there were, were poor elementary schools. There was no thought of providing for a native Swedish-American ministry. As such were the conditions, it is no wonder that the drift toward the English language, and a friendliness toward the English church became more and more apparent.

Rudman's successor was Andrew Sandel, provost from 1702 to 1709. He found it difficult to know what to do when services in English were requested, particularly because of the attitude of the vestry of his church. He wrote:

> Sometimes it is concluded in the vestry that no more English preaching shall be held, no English any more be buried in the graveyard. Then the minister and church officers are decried as persons who regard all English heathen. They think that it is a failure in duty to water one part of the Lord's vineyard to overflowing, while many other parts wither and die. So this must be changed again. One will have his child baptized in English, another in Swedish, at one and the same hour in the Church. Some refuse to stand as sponsors if the child is not baptized in Swedish, and yet it may be that the other sponsors do not understand it. One woman who is to be churched will have Swedish; the other English; and this at the same time. When funeral sermons are preached, English people of every form of faith come together, and then it often happens that the one desires preaching in English, the other in Swedish, and that just as the minister is going into the Church.[13]

An intimate relationship began to be established with the rectors of the Church of England during the provostship of Sandel. The Swedish pastors were regular attendants at the English pastoral conferences, and in the absence of the English rectors, preached in their pulpits. On the fourth Sunday after Easter, 1712, the Rev. George Ross of the English church at Chester and the Rev. Eric Bjork at Wilmington exchanged pulpits.[14] When a corner stone was laid or a church consecrated by the English, the

12 *Ibid.*, p. 105.
13 Acrelius, *op. cit.*, p. 361.
14 Jacobs, *The Lutherans*, p. 98.

Swedes were regularly invited, and accepted the invitation. While Christ Church, Philadelphia, was being enlarged in 1710, the Swedes arranged their services so that the English congregation could use the building every Sunday at eleven o'clock. In 1715 the English rector, Mr. Phillips, had rendered himself very obnoxious to his congregation, and had to leave. During the vacancy of two months, Sandel, at the request of the governor and of the English clergy, preached an English sermon directly following his Swedish service.[15] His own explanation of the relationship between the two churches is interesting:

> They have the government in their hands; we are under them; it is enough that they want to have this intercourse with us; we can do nothing else than render them every service and fraternal favor, as long as they are so amiable and confiding, and have not sought in the least to draw our children into their church. As our Church is called by them the "Sister-Church of the Church of England," so we live fraternally together. God grant that this may long continue.[16]

During the provostship of Sandel, Andrew Hesselius, who succeeded Bjork, was pastor at Wilmington, 1713-1723. He was an organizer of unusual ability, and a pastor who shepherded his people. But he received so little financial support from his people that he lacked both "food and raiment."[17] As a result, he gladly accepted an appropriation of ten pounds a year from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and an equal amount for which he was to "'perform divine service and preach in the English language in the several vacant churches in Pennsylvania, at least twenty times in one year."[18]

Hesselius' successor was John Eneberg, who was ordained by the Rev. Mr. Norborg, the Swedish pastor in London, upon orders from Bishop Svedberg of Skara. He preached successfully to the Germans in America, who were without pastors, but his attempts to preach in English were unsuccessful. So little support did he receive from his congregation, that he, a bachelor, felt constrained

15 *Ibid.*, p. 220. Acrelius says of this incident, "Confidence shown by the English missionaries .... also shows that the English Church is more disposed to affiliate with the Lutheran than with the Scotch or Presbyterian Church."

16 Graebner, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

17 Acrelius, *op. cit.*, p. 278.

18 *Ibid.*, pp. 282-283.

to rent out the parsonage and go from home to home among the members of the congregation. When he left, the church sold some of its land to pay back salary.[19]

Very influential was John Dylander, pastor at Wicaco, 1737-1741. He preached in three languages in his church. Matins were in German, the chief service in Swedish, and vespers in English, for the young people needed services in the language they best understood. So popular did he become with the English-speaking people that the English rector complained to the governor of the weddings which Dylander was taking from him.[20] About this same time Peter Tranberg was pastor at Christina, and also found it necessary to introduce English services there. Some at first opposed the English services, but because many English were in the neighborhood and because some of Swedish descent understood no Swedish, it was decided that vespers were to be in English.[21]

Israel Acrelius, the historian of the Swedish church on the Delaware, wrote in 1749 in his records as follows:

> I judge it to be necessary to keep the records of the Church in the Swedish language without any mixture of English, but the writing will be in Roman letters instead of Swedish, as heretofore—
>
> 1st. That they who understand Swedish and can write with English letters, may here find good reading, as no Swedish American at present can read anything written with Swedish letters.
>
> 2nd. The Latin letters are much used in Sweden at this time, and the use of them both in writing and printing is increasing fast, so that even those books which are in the monkish character will be printed in the style which was common before the monks altered the letters.
>
> 3rd. I have bought a number of Swedish psalm books in the same style with the approval of the Archbishop, and as they seem to be in demand on account of the style, I have written for more, and also humbly requested that the books sent hereafter may be of the same sort, thus making the instruction of the young more easy. My successors who will reap the harvest of this, I hope will never deviate from this, and also will earnestly endeavor

19 *Ibid.*, p. 293. Jacobs, *op. cit.*, p. 101.
20 Acrelius, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-237.
21 *Ibid.*, p. 295.

to keep up the knowledge of the Swedish language, their mother tongue, which is now much declined.[22]

Another paragraph from Acrelius' record shows that both the church and the Swedish language had declined:

The Christian teaching is in a very sorrowful state, both as to quality and practice. From the time of the departure of Provost Andreas Hesselius no Swedish school has been kept, and the children have gone to English schoolmasters who have simply taught them to read. Some of the people have taught their children in the Swedish so far as they thought necessary. The late Pastor Tranberg is said to have sometimes catechized the children, but as no record was kept, I do not know what children they were, nor what prayers were used and taught. Another sign of great ignorance of doctrine is, that the Lord's Supper is fallen into contempt."[23]

When Acrelius had been in America three years, dissatisfaction arose, partly because of the disorderly condition of the church accounts, due to the carelessness of the trustees, and partly because some of the members wished to accuse their pastor "because he had preached English once a month and at times in strange places."[24]

A brighter day seemed to dawn for the Swedish church in America during the provostship of Charles Magnus Wrangel, 1759-1768. The Swedish Lutheran churches in the colonies then had about 3,000 members. During the gloomy years preceding Wrangel's arrival the Church of England had tried to attract the Swedes, and, in Muhlenberg's words, "to make an end to the Swedish Evangelical Lutheran Church in this country."[25] Muhlenberg, in an address at the Swedish conference in 1761, to which he was invited, spoke in glowing terms of Wrangel's work among both the Swedes and the English:

In all these churches I was an eye witness of all the great changes which the merciful God has wrought among our Swedish brethren and their English relations by means of your most faithful services. In Kingsess I noticed with astonishment how from all sides, not only the Swedes, but also

22 "The Records of Holy Trinity (Old Swedes) Church, Wilmington, Del., from 1697 to 1773. Translated from the original Swedish by Horace Burr, with an abstract of the English records from 1773 to 1810," Vol. IX of *Papers of the Historical Society of Delaware,* (Wilmington, 1890), pp. 420-421.

23 *Op. cit.,* p. 422.

24 *Ibid.,* p. 462.

25 Jacobs, *op. cit.,* p. 256.

the English and Germans, came together in large crowds, how attentive they were and how eager to hear the Word of God..... Trustworthy and venerable Swedes said to me, 'that, owing to the indefatigable labors of His Reverence, the provost, in visiting every family, and his condesecnding instructions of the youth in Swedish and English, more than twenty adult persons had already received Baptism . . . . that all those Swedes who had connected themselves with the High Church at Chester had returned to the church of their fathers; and that even a number of influential English residents had declared their readiness to join the Lutheran congregation in case a church could be built, and there would also be English services in addition to the Swedish.'[26]

Dr. Wrangel's work was cut short by his recall to Sweden, which reached him as a bolt out of the blue on May 17, 1765, much to the chagrin of the members of the congregation, who dearly loved him. Pastors Borrell, Wicksell and Haggenblad, the latter Wrangel's assistant, had accused the provost in a letter to Sweden because of his pietism, and pietism was not in favor in Sweden.[27] Proof of his pietism was seen in his friendly relations with Muhlenberg and with Whitefield, both of whom were considered pietists by Wrangel's associates.[28] Pietism began in Germany as a movement within the church, led by Jacob Spener, to improve religious conditions and to save Christianity from formal orthodoxy. "Collegia pietatis" were established in many centers. The reading of the Bible, the practical nature of Christianity, the evils of religious controversy, practical preaching, and piety were insisted upon.[29] Of the movement McGiffert says, "Pietism was one of the forces which brought the modern age in the religious life of Germany. It preceded rationalism, and unlike the latter as it was in spirit and interest, it yet prepared the way for it by weakening the hold of the ecclesiastical institution with its creeds and sacraments. It was as individualistic as rationalism, though in a very different way, and in Germany, at least, it represented, on the whole advance, not reaction, in the development of religious thought."[30] In Germany

26 J. Nicum, D.D., "Professor Graebner's History," in *The Lutheran Church Review,* XII (July, 1893), p. 274.

27 Graebner, *op. cit.*, p. 386.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 383.

29 Arthur Cushman McGiffert, *Protestant Thought Before Kant* (New York, 1911), pp. 155, 157.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 161.

it was confined to the church, and as Francke, the teacher of Muhlenberg and the man instrumental in sending him to America, was a pietist leader, it is no wonder that the associates of Wrangel looked upon the friendship of these men with suspicion.[31] Both entertained relations with the men of the Church of England, and both were friendly to Whitefield, who represented a form of English pietism. Both also were friendly with Schlatter of the Reformed church and Tennent of the English church.[32] Wrangel had joined Muhlenberg in establishing the first Lutheran synod in this country, and this close fellowship with the Germans was resented by the other Swedish pastors.

So bitter was the feeling in the congregation that it was seriously proposed by his congregation to petition the Bishop of London to take Wicaco, Kingsessing, and upper Merion into his care, and to ask him to appoint Wrangel as the pastor, "to officiate conformably to the liturgy of the Church of England."[33] The plan was prepared and was to be presented to the vestry of Gloria Dei Church. Although it was not presented, it shows the tenor of the people at the time. The paper fell into the hands of Muhlenberg, who transcribed the proposed resolutions into his diary:

> We, the Church Wardens and Vestrymen of the incorporated Swedish congregations of Wicacoa, Kingsessing and Upper Merion, in the County of Philadelphia and Province of Pennsylvania, taking into our most serious consideration the state of the said congregations, and finding that all the members thereof do fully understand Divine Service in the English Tongue, and that there are at present but a few, and there will probably soon be none, who are able to understand Divine Service in the Swedish Tongue, and considering further the great inconvenience of continuing the present method of calling home our ministers to Sweden, without our consent, when they become capable of officiating to us in English, and of sending others in their stead, who for several years cannot be able to speak that language; by which means the cause of religion must suffer among us, we must be deprived of our ministers perhaps when they become most useful to us, and obliged to receive others without knowing them, or having any voice in their choice; Wherefore, in

31 John Nicum, "The Confessional History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States," in *Papers of the American Society of Church History,* IV (1892), p. 99.

32 Graebner, *op. cit.,* p. 383.

33 "Three Notable Documents," *Lutheran Church Review,* XII, 199.

consideration of the premises, and that we live under an English Government, and are entitled to all the privileges thereof, and thoroughly approve of the church established in England, as agreeing in all essential points with the Swedish Church, whereof we are members, we have found it necessary, with all possible gratitude for the care heretofore manifested to us by the Church and Government of the Kingdom of Sweden, hereby to resolve that for the future, agreeable to the privileges of other English subjects in this province, our ministers shall be chosen by the Church Wardens and Vestrymen of the said Churches, and recommended for the license of approbation of the Bishop of London, or such other Bishop, as shall be authorized by His Majesty, the King of Great Britain, to superintend the Episcopal Churches in America, agreeable to the custom of other Episcopal Churches in the city of Philadelphia. And we do hereby accordingly nominate and appoint our worthy minister, Charles Magnus Wrangel, Doctor in Divinity, to be our minister for the next three years succeeding the date hereof, and to officiate to us, conformable to the Liturgy of the Church of England; and we will respectfully address the Lord Bishop of London to take our churches under his protection in common with the Episcopal Churches of this Province, and to approve and license our said minister accordingly. Entered in our Minutes and given under the seal of our Corporation this —— Day of October, 1767.[34]

When Wrangel left for Sweden, he went by way of England, and carried a letter to the Bishop of London from the Rev. Richard Peters. Whether Wrangel even knew its contents and whether or not it correctly shows his position, it is impossible to say:

It is not unknown to your lordship, that the Church of England in the province has been always in connection with the Swedish Churches, and that the missionaries sent from Sweden who have, except in a very few instances, been persons of eminent learning and piety have at all times given us a very ready assistance and done us many substantial services.

The Rev. Dr. Wrangel, whom I have made bearer of this letter on purpose to introduce him to your lordship, is of the first rank amongst these missionaries and is now on his return to Sweden after an absence of nine years. Before he came here he was in high esteem with the King of Sweden and is one of his Majesty's Domestic Chaplains.

His Majesty indeed appointed him Commissary of the Swedish Church here and Rector of the Old Swedish Church at Wicaco in the neighborhood of this city as a Parochial Pastor. I can truly say he has been indefatigable. He has given very instructive lectures on week days that have spread among his people a good knowledge of religious principles and as Commissary it has been his constant care to visit all the Churches, though they are at great dis-

34 *Lutheran Church Review*, XII, 198-199.

tances from one another, carefully, and wherever he could he has given encouragement to settle regular and pious ministers and has actually built Churches and brought into Church Communion numbers of people who were without any public worship.

He knows all the affairs of this Province and the state of Religion and the situation in our own and the German Churches and I most humbly and earnestly recommend it to your Lordship to enter into free and full conversation with him. The Presbyterians under a pretense of answering Dr. Chandler have gone into many abusive publications and have raised against them all other Churches in common from the bitterness and vengeance that appears in their writings; as they are numerous, all other persuasions begin to dread and unite against them as people who have more tyranny in their System and Temper than any other Church whatever.

Dr. Wrangel wants to take a just advantage of this general antipathy to the Presbyterians, and to unite the great body of Lutherans and Swedes with the Church of England, who, you know, are but few and in mean circumstances in this province, but, were they united with the German Lutherans, we should both become respectable. This Dr. Smith and I think may be done by the means of our academy. We might have a professorship of divinity opened in it wherein German and English youth might be educated, and by having both languages as a part of their education they might preach both in German and English in such places where there is a mixture of both nations. This would conciliate us all and make us live and love as one nation. It is a happy thought. I wish your lordship would talk with Dr. Wrangel and encourage it all you can.[35]

After the Revolutionary War, when the Episcopal church in Pennsylvania was reduced to the merest shadow and was, as the Swedish church, an orphan church, the Perkiomen parish of that church asked Muhlenberg for advice concerning the manner in which to procure a properly ordained rector. A young man, John Wade, was sent to him for examination, and, after being examined by Muhlenberg, Muhlenberg urged, August 6th, 1779, that he be chosen by the parish. "The ordination," he suggested, "may be easily obtained, if not by a Bishop, yet by a regular united Protestant ministry which is the nearest related to your Episcopal Church as well as from the Episcopacy."[36] Wade is important, because he became the first associate rector of the Swedish

35 William Stevens Perry, *Papers Relating to the History of the Church in Pennsylvania, 1680-1778* (New York, 1871), p. 433.

36 "Three Notable Documents," *Lutheran Church Review*, XII, 203.

churches, the first link in the chain that carried the Swedish Lutheran churches over to the Episcopal church. More and more the young people in the Swedish churches became dissatisfied and demanded divine services in the language of the country. But no adequate provision could be made for them as the Swedish churches had neglected to train an American ministry, capable of using both Swedish and English. The Swedish church in America was still thought of as a branch of a national church. No effort was made to cultivate a sense of responsibility and self-support on the part of the descendants of the Swedes, many of whom were several generations removed from the original immigrants.[37] The Germans had not yet trained a native ministry, and there were no Lutheran pastors, aside from Muhlenberg and his co-workers, who could preach in the language of the country. Even if there had been a native German-American ministry, it is doubtful whether it could satisfactorily have supplied the needs of the Swedes. Both indeeed were Lutherans, but the differences between them were great. The Swedes had a highly developed liturgy: the Germans cared little about form. Many of the Germans were pietists, and the Swedes feared an emotional type of religion.

After the recall of Wrangel, friendly relations on the part of the Swedes with the German Lutherans ceased. Dissatisfaction arose on the part of the young people in the Swedish churches, who demanded English services. Make-shift arrangements were made, but were not satisfactory. In 1773, at Philadelphia, services were conducted in English twice a month and at Wilmington an English service was held every third Sunday in the month. Nils Collin, the last of the pastors sent from Sweden, arrived in 1770. In 1778 he begged to be recalled.[38]

The spirit of independence, which was pervading the country, was felt also in the Swedish congregations. Daniel Kuhn, of Lancaster, a young man who had studied under Wrangel and then gone to Sweden to continue his studies, was desired as pastor at

37 Abdel Ross Wentz, *The Lutheran Church in American History* (Philadelphia, 1923), p. 40.

38 John Curtis Clay, *Annals of the Swedes on the Delaware, From their First Settlement in 1636, to the Present Time* (Philadelphia, 1834; second edition, 1858), p. 123.

Philadelphia. The church council of Gloria Dei, Philadelphia, petitioned the archbishop of Sweden to appoint Kuhn assistant pastor. They frankly said that they wanted "a preacher of their own choice, and a native American."[39] A few months later, they asked that Kuhn be appointed successor to their pastor, Göransson, who had resigned. These requests were refused. The authorities in Sweden insisted upon the control of the appointments as long as they were expected to contribute to the support.

Collin in 1786 was appointed pastor at Philadelphia. The church council approved, upon the condition that the right of the congregation to choose a pastor "from this side of the water" should be respected.[40] Three years later came the final break with Sweden.

Permission was given the Swedish pastors to return. Collin, however, remained here, dying in 1831. Efforts were made to secure a former pupil of Wrangel, Christian Streit, pastor at Winchester, Virginia, to come to Philadelphia, but were not successful. As there was no American Lutheran pastor available, John Wade, the Episcopalian who had studied under Muhlenberg, was called in 1788 to become assistant in the Swedesboro church. Collin, during his pastorate, had eight Episcopal assistants, and himself used the Book of Common Prayer.[42] Soon the charters of the various churches were changed so as to permit pastors to belong to either the Lutheran or the Episcopal churches. From 1792 on, the pastor of the Wilmington church was an Episcopalian, and in 1803 the first Episcopal confirmation occurred at Wilmington. For a time the congregations were independent, but gradually they became Episcopalian. Gloria Dei, Philadelphia, became connected with the Episcopal church in 1846, and soon the others followed suit. Inability to minister to the descendants of the old Swedes in the English language, due to failure to provide for a native American ministry, was the main cause of their loss to the Lutheran church.

39 Jacobs, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

40 Snyder B. Simes, *The Swedes and the Protestant Episcopal Church* (republished by Elizabeth Virginia Callahan, Philadelphia, 1916), p. 11.

41 *Ibid.*, p. 12.

42 Clay, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

OF THE CAUSE OF SIN[1]

W. H. BRUCE CARNEY
Hartwick Seminary, New York

Of the Cause of Sin, they teach, that although God doth create and preserve nature, yet the cause of sin is the will of the wicked, that is, of the devil and ungodly men; which will, unaided of God, turns itself from God, as Christ says (John 8:44): "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own" (The Augsburg Confession, Article XIX).

Our Article is unique in that none of a like character appears in any other confession or creed. It is brief, being intended as supplementary to Article II "Of Original Sin." Its use of the verbs "create" and "preserve"—in the present tense—is clearly meant to include both original sin and that which we mean by actual sin. It is not only one of the shortest articles in the Confession, but also one of the most difficult. Says Professor Whitehead: "All simplifications of religious dogma are shipwrecked upon the rock of the problem of evil." The Bible, the Christian's only source book of theology, gives no theory as to the cause of sin and does not even define it for us comprehensively. "The Bible is rich in terms descriptive of sin, but gives no definition of it. The statement in I John 3:4, 'Sin is lawlessness,' is not a definition, but a characterization of one vital aspect of sin."[2] Our article does not venture beyond the plain teachings of the Scriptures.

So far, the philosophers who have sought for an extra-scriptural explanation have found themselves thrown back from every attempt to pierce the dark wall of mystery. Henry van Dyke has offered the following as reasons for failure: "Man cannot find the perfect answer because his reason is limited and conditioned, and because his intellectual power itself has developed under the shadow, and within the sphere, of the very malign presence which he seeks to account for." "We can give no rational account of its origin because its origin seems irrational." Of the little, com-

1 The Holman Lecture, Gettysburg Seminary, May 6, 1930.
2 A. G. Voigt, *Between God and Man* (Philadelphia, 1926), p. 68.

mon words in our article—God, man, nature, son, will, cause, devil —how little we know of any one of them, notwithstanding the monumental attempts of the world's greatest minds to comprehend them. Of these, sin and cause are not the least difficult. The Bible, our Symbol, reason,—all alike fail us. If we turn to nature we shall likely come to accept the remark of Huxley that no light is to be found here, nature being the "headquarters of the enemy." "As regards the problem of evil," says Frederick von Huegel, "it is as if we were out in the dark night, with one little candle in our hands." But if this figure is true, then the way is not without some little radiance on our path. And in the words of Pascal, "The Christian faith exists for two purposes only, the establishment of the corruption of nature and of the redemption of Jesus Christ."

As additional reasons for our venture, we should remind ourselves of the other sublime questions which are inextricably bound up with this one. With this is involved the whole life of Christ on earth. Would the Son of God have become incarnate if man had not sinned? Would we be interested in the question of the freedom of the will, or that of the immortality of the soul, if there were no sin? How much Bible would we have,—any of the New Testament? How much of the Old? What would God mean to us? Would there be religion at all or only ethics? Then, too, we could not refrain from asking ourselves these questions, even if we had absolutely no light whatever. The ultimate causes of many things which touch our lives will perhaps never be discovered while the world stands. But the last man to live upon the earth, if he be an intelligent creature, will die, as we, with the unanswered questions dwelling in his mind. But the church, too, must continue to seek for an answer for the sake of its own security. During the War, a group of British chaplains said: "The faith which will command the future will be that which deals most adequately with the problem of evil."

I

A brief glance at Article XIX will reveal the fact that it is a very inadequate answer to the questions that it raises. Strictly

interpreted, it involves a logical contradiction: that what is true of the whole is not true of all its parts. God is the creator and preserver of all nature, but not of sin. It must follow then that if God as creator of "nature" is not the creator of sin, sin is not a part of nature. If it really exists, it came into being without God, by some other power or creator. God then is not the only creator. By this process of reasoning we reach a dualistic conception of the universe. The dualistic cosmology is very old. In religion it reached its finest expression in Zoroastrianism. But this religion has become practically monotheistic and is itself almost extinct. If, on the other hand, we say that sin was not a part of the nature which God created, and also that it was not created by another power, we again have two choices before us. Either sin existed from all eternity, which points once more towards a dualism, or else sin does not exist at all—is only a delusion. If we admit that God is the creator of all things (and the term "'nature" is meant to include all), then we make him the creator of something which is antagonistic to him and generally considered harmful to his creatures. To concede either of these alternatives would amount to a denial of one or more of his attributes: omniscience, omnipotence, and love.

Another way of stating our problem more from the ethical standpoint is to ask how to reconcile universal guilt with universal freedom. Sin is acknowledged to be universal; sin implies guilt; guilt implies the freedom of the person who sinned. But if men are free to sin or not to sin, why does every person sin?

We are shut out by the Holy Scriptures and by the Confession itself from resort to any method which would limit God. In Article I he is defined: "There is one Divine Essence which is called and which is God: eternal, without body, without parts, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things, visible and invisible."

If we turn for a way out of our narrow confines to the doctrine of sin, we find ourselves also defeated here, as again both Scripture and the Confession teach its universality. In Article II we read: "Also they teach, that since the Fall of Adam, all men

begotten according to nature, are born with sin, that is, without the fear of God, without trust in God, and with concupiscence; and that this disease, or vice of origin, is truly sin."

No one who is familiar with the Confession would think for a moment that its illustrious authors were unconscious of its inadequacies. What we needs must admire them for is the fine restraint, in this and other articles, in being content to rest their statements wholly on the Bible, refusing to commit their faith to the perils of any rationalistic explanation. The question is pertinent, in view of the difficulties involved, Why did they, of all creed-makers, undertake to say anything at all on the subject?

The answer is found in the immediate occasion for the article. This was the desire to defend themselves at the Diet at Augsburg from the charge of holding any views of sin not acceptable to the Catholic church as there represented, and to set forth a positive confession of their own faith as generally believed. The view of the will, in its relation to sin, held by the Catholic group, known as Semi-Pelagian, was not acceptable to the Lutherans. The view which had formerly been held by Luther, Melanchthon, and some of their associates was predestinarian, and not acceptable to the Catholics. Any one who will read the article now, keeping in mind what it aimed to accomplish, will admire the skill manifest in its composition in rejecting without naming what the Lutherans were in danger of being accused of, and without at the same time endorsing the Catholic view, or even stating more definitely their own. Surely we would be unfair to expect more to be done within such brief compass, and especially would we not expect to find any detailed theory as to the ultimate cause of sin, a problem which belongs to metaphysics rather than to theology.

The article was presented at Augsburg, June 25, 1530, as it now appears in the Confession. On August 3, the Emperor having given his approval, the reply of the Catholics was presented. In this "Confutation" we read: "The nineteenth article is likewise approved and accepted. For God, the supremely good, is not the author of evils, but the rational and defectible will is the cause of sin; wherefore let no man impute his misdeeds and crimes to God, but to himself, according to Jeremiah 2:19, 'Thine own wickedness

shall correct thee, and thy backslidings shall reprove thee'; and Hosea 13:9, 'O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thy help.' And David in the spirit acknowledged that God is not one that hath pleasure in wickedness, Psalm 5:4."

This article of the Confutation appears at first sight quite noncommittal. However, a little attention to it will reveal that while it approves, it at the same time shifts the emphasis. It makes no mention of the devil; it gives, as proof texts, Old Testament references exclusively; it also commits itself to a doctrine of sin, namely, that the cause of sin lies in the "defectible will" of man, a part of Augustine's theory. All of these points have significance.

At the beginning of May, 1531, Melanchthon published the Apology of the Augsburg Confession. Of this article he says: "The nineteenth article the adversaries receive, in which we confess that although God only and alone has framed all nature, and preserves all things which exist, yet the cause of sin is the will in the devil and men, turning itself away from God, according to the saying of Christ concerning the devil (John 8:44), 'When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh it of his own.'" The point of chief interest here lies in the fact that Melanchthon takes no notice of the contents of the reply of the Confutation, but simply reiterates the article as it was presented in the Confession, with its implications that the devil is the author of original sin, and the will of evil men that of actual sins; that the theory of a "defectible will" in man is not acceptable; that the will of man has a lesser part in sin than the quotations from the Old Testament, taken alone, would imply; and that the New Testament is preferable to the Old as a source of proof texts on the subject.

During the years that followed the Augsburg Diet of 1530 Melanchthon made several changes in other articles of the Confession. We do not know of any change whatever in Article XIX. Several other doctrinal formulas were written, many of them becoming official creeds in the various Lutheran provinces and cities. In none of these writings was this article disputed. The Augsburg Confession is the one symbol from these Reformation times which has been adopted by all Lutheran countries alike. And,

finally, the Formula of Concord, published in 1580, in commemoration of the semicentennial of the Augsburg Diet, defends this article at considerable length against Manichaean and other errors current at that time or at some earlier day.

The first argument, therefore, which we offer in support of the article under discussion as a true expression of the doctrine it was written to set forth, is the fact that it stood the severe testings of those first fifty years of theological wars and creedal victories, coming through all, not only unscathed and sound, but strengthened by the supports which rallied about it, and greatly cherished because it seemed the embodiment of sacred and revealed truth.

II

The succeeding period of Lutheran church history is spoken of as the Scholastic. During this time the Lutheran creeds received much study, approval, defense, explanation, and almost adoration. Says Christlieb: "The post-Reformation preaching of the sixteenth, and still more rigidly, the Lutheran preaching of the seventeenth century, preserved for about a century and a half its confessional character. The pulpit aimed to defend the Confession in the most extreme points of doctrine."[3] Some there were who asserted that the symbols were "entirely divine" and hence "obligatory on all points." One explanation is the fact that many of the old disagreements with the Catholic and with other Protestant groups still persisted and were exalted into slogans and battle-cries during the long civil and religious wars. As would be natural, both the evil and the good of controversies struggled for the place of honor. "The devotion to form," says Luthardt, "that is, the causal method[4] . . . . finally made the scientific presentation external and destitute of life."

Of the dogmaticians of this period we offer a quotation from three of the earliest and ablest. Hutter (1563-1616), professor at Wittenberg (1596-1616), whose Compend of Theology was used for a century in the schools of Germany, in writing about Romans

3 For a complete discussion of this period see J. W. Richard, *The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church,* chapters XXIX-XXXII.

4 *Causa efficiens, materialis, formalis, finalis.*

5:15-18, states: "It is noteworthy that the Apostle does not say 'of (*ex*) one man,' but 'by (*per*) one man,' thus implying that the principal efficient cause was Satan." Again: "God as the universal cause, affords only this, viz., that you are able to act, but the fact that you act wickedly proceeds from a cause, viz., your perverse will." If Hutter were living today, he would be forced to seek some other argument, seeing that our American Revised Version has adopted the phrase "of one man."

Quenstedt (1617-1688), also a professor at Wittenberg, wrote: "The external, first and principal cause (but remote) of this (original) sin is Satan acting .... by mere external moral suasion." "The instrumental cause is a true and natural serpent, but possessed by the devil." "The internal and directly efficient cause is the intellect and will of the first man, not from any internal defect therein, which could not exist in an unfallen state, but by way of accident, in consequence of the wandering and departure from God, through seduction without."

Quenstedt has been placed by Bossuet, a famous French Catholic preacher, with Luther and Chemnitz in that series of Lutheran theologians which has no fourth. The extract given points towards the efforts made by these men to found theology as a science on Aristotle, a practice characteristic of the Middle Ages and also of this period. The serpent is the "instrumental" cause; the intellect and will of the first man constitutes the "efficient" cause. Would it not be a fair question to ask him, as Aristotle might, What, then, is the *formal* and the *final* cause? What are we to infer from Quenstedt's silence here? Was he lost at this point, or embarrassed merely by what would seem to be the rational answer? The other significant expression in this quotation is the phrase "by way of accident." This, too, is Aristotelian. For him, an object was constituted of substance, i. e. that without which it could not exist, and accidents, qualities which inhere in this substance, but are not essential to its existence. Sin is by the "way of accident," not that of the substance. The latter idea was Manichaean, revived in the Reformation controversies, and condemned by the Formula of Concord. The distinction here made between

substance and accidents is easier to state than to conceive. It figures widely in theology. But proofs for any doctrines which are based wholly on it rest insecurely. An expression relative to this insecurity is found in the Formula of Concord, Part II, Chapter I. It is a question "to which no philosopher, no Papist, no sophist, yea, no human reason, however acute it may be, can give the right explanation, but all understanding and every explanation of it must be derived solely from the Holy Scriptures."

Hollazius (1646-1713) is sometimes spoken of as the last of the Dogmaticians. He says: "When Eve extended her hand to the forbidden fruit, two acts were present: first, the extension of the hand; second, the extension applied to the forbidden fruit. The former act is said to be the remote material (cause); the latter the proximate material (cause). With the latter, God does not concur, because His concurrence is general and indeterminate; and, therefore, the determination to this or that object is not from God as from the first and universal cause, but from the second and particular cause."

This is the Concurrence theory. "It is true and useful as far as it goes," says Dr. A. G. Voigt concerning it. "But it does not go to the root of the difficulty, for God still seems to aid the evil deed."[5] At first sight it would seem to have something to commend itself to us. God gives us help and direction in a general way, but not in particular acts. Dr. H. E. Jacobs specifies four ways in which God may concur: by permission; by hindrance; by direction; by determination.[6] But a closer study of the solution offered in concurrence will disillusion us. What constitutes the difference between a general and a particular act? If God concurred with Eve in reaching forth her hand as far as the apple, and then withheld further assistance, how was she able to pluck it? After she had realized what she had done and began to brush the hot tears of sorrow from her swimming eyes, did God concur in directing her hands to her eyes?

This question suggests another method of approach to this particular theory: that of making the moral quality of the act the

5 *Between God and Man*, p. 48.

6 H. E. Jacobs, *A Summary of the Christian Faith* (Philadelphia, 1905), p. 73.

determining factor. God concurs in the effect of an action but not in its moral defect. If we apply this to the Eve incident, we might be moved to ask when the act became defective, and how was she able to perform the defective act alone? If she was created perfect, how could sin secure a hold in her heart? If she was not perfect, who is responsible then for her failure? Augustine has bequeathed to us two celebrated phrases—able to sin, able not to sin—as descriptive of the nature of man as created. For me, they seem insufficient. They state merely a condition at the time of sin, but give no answer as to its cause. I have seen somewhere in a glass case from which all the air has been removed, a pair of scales perfectly balanced, the beam standing horizontal. The least added weight will tip it either way. If it remains undisturbed, it will remain on a balance forever. How could a disturbance of the moral balance occur in the heart of a perfect man unless some new force from without act upon him? Says Schmidt, "The most difficult problem in the science of Theology is that of exhibiting the method of divine concurrence in the evil actions of men, without at the same time in any wise throwing the blame for the evil upon the first cause, i. e., upon God."[7]

My primary purpose in using these extracts is to show the intense desire of these representative men to defend the Confession in all its points, not only as a true, but even a near-divine expression of truth. They acknowledged the fact of sin; they made laudable efforts to strengthen the fact by explaining its cause. But it is readily seen that their attempts, made to buttress the Biblical teaching with material from the quarries of formal reason, failed to give a sense of security as complete and perfect as might be desired.

A reaction against this intellectual emphasis in religion was sure to come. The movement is known as Pietism. Spener (1635-1705) was its founder. The securing of a deeper devotional life through Bible study and prayer was its aim. It wrought great changes, nourished to manhood a half-starved church, gave birth to great leaders, vitalized literatures, held in check the rising tide

7 Schmidt, *Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia, 1889), p. 185.

of Rationalism at home, and broke the barriers that had held the Lutheran faith within the confines of the European continent. A marked change of attitude toward the Confessions of the church was inevitable. Spener manifested impatience with those Lutherans "who scrupled to subscribe to the Symbolical Books, though he did not concede that such books were inspired neither did he extend subscription to all their sharp points."[8] But by denying the inspiration and perfection ascribed to the Symbolical Books by the Orthodoxy of the former period, a different place came to be assigned to them. Subscription to their substance, in subordination to the Holy Scriptures, rather than to their letter and form, was considered sufficient. We are only interested at present to know whether the Confession with its nineteenth article was looked upon as a true and valuable formula of the faith of the Lutheran church of the time. This, the quotation sufficiently shows. The Confession was more or less neglected. But during the period of Pietism it was not entirely ignored.

III

The strength of Pietism was its emphasis on the emotional elements of religion rather than tradition and authority. In this respect it was a child of its time, and found a congenial home awaiting its arrival. But the children born of mystic experience need always to be wrapped about with the swaddling garments of reason and experience if they are to survive. Here Pietism failed. It seemed unable to make the adjustments required by modern philosophy, the new scientific method, and the revolutionary astronomical discoveries of the seventeenth century; and the church, in a brief while, drove it forth to welcome instead the child of the succeding age, the Age of Rationalism.

Though rationalism did not reach its maturity until the eighteenth century, its birth occurred a hundred years earlier, in the "Century of Genius," as Whitehead terms it. Scholars of this period broke with tradition in science, philosophy, and religion. "In religion, it meant the appeal to the origins of Christianity; and in science it meant the appeal to experiment and the inductive

8 J. W. Richard, *op. cit.*, p. 548.

method of reasoning."[9] Whitehead devotes a chapter to a discussion of a "sacred twelve" of these geniuses,—Bacon, Harvey, Kepler, Galileo, Descartes, Pascal, Huyghens, Bayle, Newton, Locke, Spinoza, Leibnitz. Every one of these disturbed the church and its theology by his teachings. Two of them, Galileo and Spinoza, were tried for heresy. The former was forced to recant; the latter was expelled from the Synagogue. Many others, Protestants as well as Catholics, narrowly escaped similar fates. They were far from being irreligious, but they were beyond the pale of rigid orthodoxy.

During this period of growing Rationalism the Symbolical Books received less attention than in the time of Pietism. Semler (1725-1791), regarded as the father of its theological phase, lectured on them at Halle, but wrote (1775) that it was not forbidden theologians to depart from the authority and sense of them. Bretschneider (1776-1848), professor at Wittenberg, states that subscription to the Saxon Formula is sufficient. Little attention is paid to the Symbolical Books by George Christian Knapp (1753-1825), professor at Halle, and "best representative of the Halle Biblical School; or by the best in the Tübingen School, Storr and Flatt (*Handbook of Dogmatic*), in which Kant secures the greater attention."[10] The second argument, then, which we offer in defense of our article is the discovery now made that during the period of Rationalism the Augsburg Confession was somewhat ignored, but it was never entirely discarded nor even repudiated.

Rationalism met its final overthrow in Germany with the failure of the Revolution of 1848. But the humiliation of Germany at the hands of Napoleon had previously caused the people to seek for a more satisfying religious faith. The king of Prussia secured in 1817 a Union of his Reformed and Lutheran subjects; Schleiermacher (1769-1834), professor at Berlin University, had been advocating the feelings instead of the reason as the legitimate religious faculty; and Claus Harms was summoning the Lutherans to a return to the Symbolical Books. These forces prevailed. There arose in Germany in consequence a new emphasis on confes-

9 A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (New York, 1927), p. 59.
10 J. W. Richard, *op. cit.*

sionalism, which was transported to America. This influence began to manifest itself strongly among us about the middle of the last century. It has continued to increase in strength and scope until today the probability of a union on the basis of the Symbolical Books, of all the various Lutheran groups among us seems assured, and a Lutheran Church of the World more than a fervent hope. We all accept the Augsburg Confession in its original, true, and only sense, as far as we are able to know the same. It is our common bond; its articles are common watchwords. It is a unique privilege which is ours today to be studying one of its articles, and an occasion of just pride that this seminary is able to complete its third series of public lectures in this Quadricentennial year, having covered in each series all of the articles, without the rejection or modification of any point, but with loving hearts and ripe scholarship having loyally defended each and all alike.

IV

Having so far shown that the Confession in its entirety has stood the testing of four hundred years of Lutheran teaching and practice, and of interdenominational controversy, we might in all fairness and good conscience rest the defense of our article at this point. What is believed everywhere, by all persons, all the time, is a rightly accredited criterion of truth. However, our peace of mind might be of the character of those, who, having overcome all tendencies to mutiny within the fortress and repulsed all assaults from without, trust that no future circumstance will arise to change the past results. But there is added security to be had by us if we will venture forth and make note of the various methods and weapons of the enemy used against us. If we find that he has exhausted the resources of strategy, we shall with greater reason rejoice in the tested strength of our tower of truth. We shall, therefore, examine the views of some of the leaders among that class of men who have delighted to think on our subject, more or less unhindered by any ecclesiastical or theological restraints, to see if by reason alone, without Revelation, they can either demolish our fortress of faith or furnish us with one more impregnable.

The place which had been accorded to philosophy during the

Middle Ages, viz., as the "handmaid of religion," was said by Bacon to form an ill-sorted pair whose "offspring was a heretical religion and a fantastical philosophy." For him, knowledge consists of the facts and causes of nature, all else being but poetic fancy, picturing the wished-for state of the world. It is easily seen how this philosophy, through his followers, Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, would lead the way straight to English Deism with its denial of the existence of sin, and to French Materialism with its denial of God, also. With this view, that the world is perfect, or may be made so by man's own native powers, we can have no debate, as there is no common basis for agreement. If there is no sin, there is no cause of sin.

Descartes (1596-1650), likewise dissatisfied with basing truth on traditional authority, sought for its foundation, not without in nature, but within his own consciousness. "I think, therefore, I am." I think necessarily of a Being the most perfect conceivable; therefore, he exists. But however satisfying this psychological basis for truth was for him, he acknowledged that the mind itself was not a *perfect* medium. The body and the soul are so different that their union prevents the right functioning of the latter. This union is essential to man's proper constitution, but it, nevertheless, hinders clear knowledge and right volition. This lack, or defect, is sin. It inheres in man's metaphysical nature.

It is readily seen that the cause of the defect, or sin, must be the Power that unites the soul with the body, or God. Descartes' writings were placed upon the Index, "donec corrigantur," while synods, universities, and scholars combined to combat his views. He was, however, permitted to die a natural death within the communion of the Catholic church. He advocated the Traducian theory of the origin of the soul, and taught that original sin is inherited by the child from the mother on account of their close physical contact during prenatal days. His most destructive influence is due to his principle, "Whatever is clearly and distinctly known is true, and this only." Reason and conscience would then be sufficient guides. Rationalism not only seized upon this principle and denied the need of a special revelation, but under the leadership

of Semler and his followers there began the attack upon the historicity and authority of the teachings of the Bible itself as revelation, which seemed to them to be contrary to reason.

Spinoza (1632-1677), reacting against Descartes, united mind and body so closely that they became really one. For him, God also was so involved in his own universe that he had no personality. There is, then, no moral law, since there is no Lawgiver. There being no law, there can be no sin. That which is called sin is a psychological defect. God is its permissive author. But it would not exist if man could see all things *sub specie aeternitatis*. "For my own part, I cannot admit that sin and evil have any positive existence, far less that anything can come to pass without the will of God." "I also maintain that only in speaking improperly, or humanly, can we say that we sin against God."[11]

Neither Descartes nor Spinoza, then, have a satisfactory answer for us. If sin is a defect of knowledge, or of man's constitution, and is purely negative, it is nothing, and therefore has no cause. If, on the other hand it is something positive and real, its cause is either the Creator of the universe, or inheres in the eternal substance.

Unsatisfactory as this attempted solution of sin as a defect is found to be, it has had many advocates. It is found among the Greek philosophers; it was dominant among the early Eastern Church Fathers; and it had a strong attraction for Augustine. The latter opposed the teaching of the Manichaeans that evil inheres in matter and that man, having a material nature, is sinful in consequence of his material body. Augustine desired to defend the view that man as first created was free from sin. To this end he advocated the idea that man was created out of nothing. How then did he become sinful? The answer was that man was not created wholly perfect. He had a defect. However, this view would not account for man's sense of guilt, and God, the creator, would be made responsible for the defect. To escape from these difficulties, this philosopher and theologian advocated that this defect was also a corruption. For this, man is responsible. But this

11 F. R. Tennant, *The Origin and Propagation of Sin* (Cambridge U. Press, 1902), p. 46.

being man's condition after the fall, to constitute the fall a sin, he must have been a free moral agent before the fall. This claim Augustine sets forth in his famous phrases "posse peccari et posse non peccari." These express rightly the needed *condition* for a moral choice. But the problem as to why man made the choice which brought him into the present state, that of "non posse non peccari," if free to choose, seems as far from a solution as ever. Place the cause in the desire of the devil to have man fall, through an effort to get revenge on God, and we then shift the question to the form: If the devil was created a good angel, how did he come to be a devil? Did the devil always exist? Then God is not the author of all things. Did God create him as an evil spirit? Then God is the author of moral evil. Augustine seemed to fluctuate between the position of his opponent, Pelagius, who, as an advocate of the freedom of the will, denied original sin and made man guilty of actual sins only, and the determinist position known later as Calvinism, which places the responsibility definitely on God, toward which he was probably the more sympathetic.[12]

Leibnitz (1646-1716) is recognized as one of the world's greatest thinkers. Like Augustine, he seems to hesitate between two possible views of sin. For him, the universe is composed of monads. These are centers of force, differing in quality. When they become confused in making a choice and fail to perceive the good and choose a lesser good, sin occurs. Sin, then, is a metaphysical imperfection of the monad. This view would ally Leibnitz also with the group already discussed. But he also offered another theory, not metaphysical, but ethical. God permits evil as a necessary condition of freedom for man, without which there could be no virtue. God gives man the power to act. The ethical qualities of any particular act are determined by man's limitations, though man is responsible for these same qualities. Sin, then, is not, in its final analysis, a sin at all, but a veiled good. Sin is a good, if considered prudentially. This view of sin became popular in Germany largely through the influence of Christian Wolff

12 For an extended criticism of Augustine's view, see Burton, *The Problem of Evil* (Chicago, 1909).

(1679-1754). He taught that "God called the world into existence by his will, and permitted sin as a means for good."

Leibnitz had maintained the existence of innate ideas. Locke denied their existence, making the senses the sole source of knowledge, as had Bacon. Berkeley doubted the reliability of our sense impressions. Hume followed by casting doubt upon the validity of the principle that every event must have a cause. Kant (1724-1804) undertook to rescue epistemology from this slough of skepticism and despair. He devotes much of his book, *Religion Within the Limits of Pure Reason,* to a discussion of the origin of moral evil. He accepts the claim that all mankind is conscious of guilt. He does not believe, however, that this feeling of guilt can be sufficiently accounted for by saying that "In Adam's fall, we sinned all." This individual consciousness of guilt implies an individual choice. Since we are not conscious of a choice as having been made in Adam, the choice must have been made in some other way and time. He resorts, therefore, to an existence of the souls of men in a prenatal sphere. There each individual made his own choice, with a will wholly free. It was a noumenal act in a transcendental existence, and a rational rather than a temporal act. This timeless act is symbolized in the Genesis account, although, since the act was timeless and rational, the account is not historical.

Kant doubtless felt that the claim that all men have a sense of individual guilt, and yet are conscious of having had no part in Adam's fall, is a contradictory and irreconcilable dilemma. He chooses to hold to a universal consciousness of guilt as the better horn to seize, rejecting the historicity of the fall and inheritance of sin from Adam. All men sinned, individually, in a previous existence.

This view of sin as originating in a prenatal state is old, at least as old as Plato, who has put it into an allegory. "Every soul may be divided into three parts, two of them resembling horses, and the third a charioteer. . . . . The horse of the two which occupies the nobler rank . . . . is driven without stroke of the whip by voice and reason alone. The bad horse scarcely yields to lash and goad united" (*Phaed.* 253). Plato describes at length the conduct

of the horses. But the point we are interested in is where the unruly, "short-necked, bloody-eyed" black horse came from—this is passed by. The myth had attractions for Philo and Plotinus. Origen used it to express, in part, his view of sin as prenatal. Traces of it are seen in Scotus, and in many writers later than Kant. But does it really throw any light on the cause of sin? Is it not simply a clever answer to the question, When did man sin? trusting to escape from the real question, Why did man sin? before we discover that our thinking has been simply sidetracked. Kant was logical enough, however, and honest enough, to confess that the problem is "inscrutable."

Coleridge (1772-1834) accepted the theory of Kant in making the fall previous to one's birth, and also timeless. He differs by making the act of choice that of mankind taken collectively. This seems as if he preferred to lay hold of the other horn of our stubborn dilemma, preferring a federated choice, and sacrificing, if need be, the claim for a universal consciousness of individual guilt. But he soon confesses that the universal, timeless collective act lies "beyond reason," and leaves us in the air in a state of animated suspense.

Schelling (1775-1854) likewise agrees with Kant in making the choice of evil prenatal, but only timeless in the sense that it occurred before the beginning of things. He agrees with Leibnitz also in making sin necessary for man's development. But he ventures a step further and makes sin necessary also for God. This view has been traced from Schelling back through Boehme and his predecessor Weigel to Eckhart the mystic. Three considerations may be offered against it. God would be limited in freedom by a law outside of him. If the limitation is necessary for God, then it can scarcely be thought of as moral evil. It has the weakness of all the theories which attempt to account for sin as having arisen in a preëxistent state, in offering a temporal instead of a causal solution. The most noted work of this school of thought in the last half century is that of Julius Mueller, professor at Halle.[13]

13 *The Christian Doctrine of Sin* (Edinburgh, 1868).

He, too, puts the time of man's sin in a prenatal state, and has much in common with Schelling.

It has been said that Spinoza denies sin without explaining it, while Hegel denies it while explaining it. Hegel (1770-1831) has this in common with Schelling that sin is necessary for both man and God, or the Absolute, in order that they may realize their several moral natures. There is a triad of states in the process of self-realization. The state of innocence, or the nonmoral state of nature, must be succeded by the state of sin, that out of these, as thesis and antithesis, virtue, their synthesis and highest form, may arise. It is sin to be content to remain in the state of innocence and inertia rather than to realize complete personality by overcoming this inertia. If the steps are completed, the Fall becomes a Rise. The Genesis account then becomes for Hegel, as for Kant, a myth. He would maintain its truth, however, as a correct psychological description of man's achievement of selfhood. Nathaniel Hawthorne has made use of Hegel's concept of sin in his romance, *The Marble Fawn*. Students of Hegel all recognize the difficulties in attempting to interpret him fairly. Hegel's thought, somewhat modified, is very basic and potent in much of the thinking on our subject at the present day. But Hegel's view, like all those that overemphasize the immanence of God, suffers wreck on the sea of life whenever it strikes the "solid rocks of sin and guilt."[14]

Friedrich Schleiermacher was a contemporary professor with Hegel at Berlin University and attained eminence in both philosophy and theology. He was the bridge between the decadence of Rationalism and the reawakening of Orthodoxy. In his views of sin he has much in common with Augustine. Like the latter, he strove valiantly to avoid a dualism. The ultimate cause of sin, then, is God. But though caused by God, sin, for Schleiermacher, is nothing more than a consciousness of sin, having a reality in the mind of man only. This consciousness of sin arises when our sense nature encounters and offers resistance to our spirit nature, which latter develops more slowly than the former. This sin does not constitute guilt in God's sight, neither is it a necessity. It is

14 E. Brunner, *The Theology of Crisis*, p. 17.

ordained of God, however, in order that there may be an occasion for sending a Redeemer. Sin originated with Adam, because he had like tendencies with us, though perfect. We inherit nothing from Adam directly but only a part of that which he and others have contributed to sin as a social, inbred inheritance.

The strenuous efforts here made to reach a compromise position are very evident. The following criticisms suggest themselves. If God gives man a consciousness of sin which is not really sin, then God is made out a deceiver. Again, if sin is naught but the consciousness of sin, then there is no sin in any person, child or adult, until a consciousness of the same comes into existence. Sin's universality and heinousness are all reduced, and original sin, as we interpret it, is denied.

Ritschl (1822-1889), professor in Goettingen, resembles Schleiermacher in many ways, and, next to him, is perhaps the most influential theologian of the mediating school at the present time. Ritschl accepts also the social solidarity of sin, but he rejects both the attempt to make this a substitute for original sin and also the fact of original sin. For him, sin springs from the natural impulses of the ever-growing will with which the knowledge of the good is not from the first connected. On this theory, sin is to be accounted for by the fact that we are compelled to meet moral problems before we are prepared to solve them. The view clearly throws the responsibility for sin upon whatever Power causes us to be in the position described, i. e., the Creator. He attempts to account for the claim of universal sin, as does Schleiermacher, but at the sacrifice of the horn of the dilemma which Kant tried to defend—the feeling of individual guilt. Sin is again made a defect of nature. This influential Lutheran theologian and philosopher takes us back again to Augustine, and beyond, and we find ourselves as helpless as he was, after fourteen centuries of scattered but sincere efforts to answer our question.

Philosophy has no answer to our question, What is the cause of sin? Where sin is made only a defect no satisfactory answer is given as to the ultimate cause of the defect. Seeing then that the

fact of sin is acknowledged and no reason given, we need not hesitate, in the presence of philosophy, to assert that our article remains intact and true as far as its claims were intended to reach.

V

The theory of biological evolution has been as disturbing to our century as the scientific theories and discoveries of the sixteenth were to that era. The theological thinkers of that time were able finally to make such adjustments as were necessary to save the entire Bible to religion, if not a literal interpretation of it to science. Evolution has come to be considered by many in our day as the best working hypothesis for the laboratory of science, even though its technique is not yet understood. It is not fully recognized as having full rights in the temple of religion. If such rights are ever given to it, additional portions of the Bible will have to be given by us an interpretation other than a historical and scientific one. The doctrine of sin will of necessity undergo modification. In fine, I do not see how any doctrine of original sin can be maintained. If no reconciliation can be found, which of these two shall we choose to defend?

Outstanding work has been done in this field by Dr. F. R. Tennant, of Cambridge University. He accepts evolution and rejects original sin. All attempts to account for actual sin, on the basis of a preceding original sin, such as we have discussed, he considers inadequate and unnecessary. In his opinion, the Bible does not teach original sin. In his view, there is nothing of it in the Old Testament whatever. The parts of the New Testament which have been used to support the doctrine are all found in one writer, the Apostle Paul, and consist of a few verses only. These, he contends, will admit of a different exegesis than has been given to them. He says: "The New Testament assumes that all men are sinners, and that all men are mortal; as to how they became sinners or how they became mortal there is nothing said, explicitly or implicitly, except in these two passages" (Romans 5:12-21; I Cor. 15:22). Tennant states that although Paul teaches that sin entered the world through one man, the exact method by which

Adam's transgression became connected with his posterity is not given. The reference to the Genesis account may be for illustrative purposes only, not meant to be scientific or historical: expressions of ideas current in the writer's time, to be superseded in the course of growth of natural knowledge, even as Paul's psychology and ethical concepts are differently clothed by modern writers. As to Jesus, he says: "In all our Lord's recorded relations with sinners no word or act necessarily implies the presence in men of aught but actual sin and self-made character."[15]

According to this modern, evolutionary theory, man's moral nature is neutral until it reaches a state of consciousness in which the right and wrong of an action is first recognized. Sin originates at this point if the lesser good is knowingly chosen instead of the greater possible good. We have seen that Kant and others who wished to maintain a universal and individual consciousness of sin, while rejecting the historicity of Adam's fall, put the original act of sin in a state prior to man's life in time. The voluntary view goes the opposite direction and makes the time of sin to be after we have lived in this life. Both views agree in rejecting the Fall. But neither view has a substitute for it. Without some reason as to why men sin, the discussion becomes merely a question as to when men sin. We are only concerned to know what answer these theories have to the first of these queries.

This theory of sin was advocated earlier than Tennant by Pfleiderer in his *Philosophy of Religion* and has been endorsed since by Burton.[16] The following criticism of it has been made by Orchard: "Tennant seeks to maintain man's full responsibility for moral evil, while admitting that his pre-moral history seriously handicaps him." But "either the natural ancestry of the human race, and the existence of the individual before the moral ideal dawns upon him, affect the question, or they do not."[17] If these antecedent conditions affect his choice, then the individual is not

15 F. R. Tennant, *The Origin and Propagation of Sin* (Cambridge U. Press, 1902), p. 150.

16 *The Problem of Evil* (Chicago, 1909).

17 W. E. Orchard, *Modern Theories of Sin* (London, 1910), p. 98.

wholly to blame. Part, at least, of his guilt must rest elsewhere. If, on the other hand, the individual arrives at the time of choice with freedom, wisdom, and strength, then how can we account for the fact that every person makes a wrong choice? And if we admit that there are some individuals who do not make a wrong choice, then we are surrendering one of the points the theory was invented to account for, viz., that every individual has a consciousness of sin.

We do not feel called upon to help these men out of their quandary. But if they are able to satisfy themselves that the Scriptures do not teach universal sin, originating from Adam, then the next thing in order would seem to be to endeavor to prove from experience that not all men have a consciousness of guilt. For this latter they could summon to their support no less a person than Athanasius. Any claim that only some of the human race feel guilty of moral evil would strengthen the effort to place full responsibility on the human will.

To lay this responsibility wholly on man's will would relieve God from any but a permissive Providence in man's sinning. Our article points in this direction—the will of man, "unaided of God, turns itself from God." Theologians have exercised themselves valiantly in the endeavor to shield God from any part in determining man to sin without at the same time being found guilty of advocating a dualistic universe, man and God; or even a pluralistic one, if each man, in eternity, made his own choice freely. Scholars of the Middle Ages accused Eve of a *delectatio morosa*, a lingering lust. Eve fell because, instead of running away from the temptation, she tarried, continued to look and listen until her desire became passion which overwhelmed her reason and will. Martensen endeavors to build out of this psychological process a causal, or metaphysical one. He tells us that desire, or lust, is fecundated by fancy, there being "a magical relation"[18] between them. The offspring of this unholy relation is passion, sin.

No person will deny the danger of delay in making choices in the presence of evil. Did Eve know of the danger? Then why

18 H. Martensen, *Christian Ethics (Individual)*, (Edinburgh, 1891), p. 86.

did she yield? If she didn't know, then—? It is certainly very naive to offer what Eve did as an explanation of why she did it. It is to acknowledge that theological science has reached a chronic invalidism when it must resort to "a magical relation" between certain elements of our feelings to account for the undesirable progeny. The fallacy here consists in setting forth the processes of the mind as its power, its activities as its actuation. But the proffered solution does not satisfy. We may call together all the ghosts of the old faculty psychology, the intellect, the sensibilities and the will, with all the family divisions and relatives discovered by all the erstwhile census-takers of the mind's activities, and add to these all the offspring of the fertile brains of the recent psychologists, and by turning them loose in the forecourt of the soul, enjoy the experience of a good, tumultuous, psychological game of pussy-wants-a-corner; but the unfortunate faculty which is styled "It," (the cause)—whether fancy, desire, passion, impulse, motive, choice, will reach safety in time, and something else will be made the victim in the next scene. To understand the status of the mind, its activities and processes, we must get back of the conscious, the co-conscious, the subconscious, the unconscious, the libido and complexes, back of impulse instinct, tendency, back of nerves and brain and glands, back into the dimly lighted laboratory of metaphysics if we are ever to hope for a discovery of the Why of sin rather than the How or When. If we fail here, as I feel we must, there is left for us naught but what the Holy Scriptures and common sense have always taught us—the fact of sin, permitted of God, arising through the "unaided" will of man, for some ultimately higher purpose.

> If the mind turn inward, she recoils
> At once—or, not recoiling, is perplexed—
> Lost in a gloom of uninspired research;
> Meanwhile the heart within the heart, the seat
> Where peace and happy consciousness should dwell,
> On its own axis relentlessly revolving,
> Seeks, yet can nowhere find, the light of truth.[19]

19 Wordsworth, "The Excursion."

To accept sin as an act permitted of God for man's ultimate good admits a principle which is not free from danger. Paul calls our attention to this: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound" (Rom. 6:1)? It also has its difficulties when we face the problem of Job,—the relation of sin to the suffering of the righteous. Calvin's offered explanation that the suffering in hell eternally, even of infants, is for "'the glory of God," an exhibition of his power, seems to conflict with our idea of his love. It seems more attractive to many, more especially recent writers, if any sacrifice must be made of God's infinities, to save his love at the expense of his power. In this view, God is not self-limited, but limited by his very nature. He is a growing God, growing from a less powerful into a more powerful Being. He works with us and through us, rather than in us and for us. The origin of the suggestion is attributed to Hume and Mill. The picture has been drawn in many forms—the almost omnipotent God of the Personal Idealists, the growing God of the "piecemeal" supernaturalism of James, the groping *élan vital* of Bergson.[20] For James, God has an environment. He is in time, and works out a history just like ourselves. "He is finite, either in power or in knowledge, or in both at once." Says Hobhouse: "The extent of the evil is the measure of the incompleteness of the order actually achieved by Mind in the world." It is "due to the partial ends that families, individuals, and classes of society selfishly pursue without regard to their effect upon others." The limitation as stated by Rashdall attempts to divide the responsibility. "God's limitations cannot be on the side of His goodness; they must be on the side of His power; there must be eternal necessities that are part of His own eternal nature. God is responsible for the evil that men do, but not in such a way as to clear men of full responsibility for their actions; indeed, in a sense, man alone is the author of evil, for he alone wills evil otherwise than a means to the ultimate good."

This view of God as limited in power by his own nature seems

20 For a fuller discussion see Wright, *A Student's Philosophy of Religion* (New York, 1925), pp. 377 ff.

irreconcilable with Holy Scripture. Moreover, it fails to satisfy man's thought and need of God. Professor Haydon offers a trenchant criticism when he states that a God limited in power would be likely limited in wisdom and goodness also. And who could take comfort in worshipping a God so limited that he may never reach the fulfillment of his plans?

Of the teachings of the so-called sects and the modernistic groups little need be said, inasmuch as none of them offer us any theory different from those we have already examined. Of those that deny the existence of both original and actual sin, Christian Science is notable. "Sin, sickness, and death are unrealities."[21] Christian Science should "cause the error to cease that brought the belief of sin and death which effaces the pure sense of omnipotence."[22] The Unitarians and many small groups reject original sin, total depravity and moral inability, but admit actual sin. On the other hand, according to the Mormon Catechism, the Fall was not only a necessary but even a happy event, for had man not partaken of the forbidden fruit, "he would not have known good and evil here, neither could he have had moral posterity." Adam and Eve "rejoiced and praised God" because they had the privilege of breaking the commandment."[23] Of those who have set forth that evil is but the absence of good, R. J. Campbell, formerly of the London City Temple, is noted. "The coming of a finite creation into being itself is of the nature of a fall, a coming down from perfection into imperfection." "Our true being is eternally one with the being of God and that to be separated from a full knowledge of that truth is to have undergone a fall." But its "purpose is good, and there is nothing to mourn over except our own slowness at getting into line with the cosmic purpose."[24] For Haydon, a recognized leader of the present Humanism, both religion and gods are the product of man's age-long "search for methods of control, comfort, and satisfaction." Moral evil is the equivalent of social

21 *Science and Health* (404th ed.), p. 472.
22 *Ibid.*, p. 318.
23 E. H. Klotsche, *Christian Symbolics* (Burlington, Ia., 1929), p. 382.
24 R. J. Campbell, *The New Theology* (New York, 1907), p. 166.

evil. It has arisen because man's "material mastery outran his social science and social control—a difficulty accentuated wherever religion escaped responsibility for making a good world here, by postponing the good life to another world or to a future age."[25] All these theories, like others examined, seek a solution either by reducing the circle of sin, or by casting suspicion on the consciousness of guilt. If sin is nothing more than ignorance and sluggishness, the remedy is not far to seek. It is up to man. He needs little, if any thing more than to be "well-fed, well-bred, and well-wed." Of such views, Orchard well remarks: "It remains to be seen whether the Christian consciousness can maintain itself upon them." But let us suppose that this could be done. Have we then solved our problem? Let us see. If belief in sin is merely "error," who is responsible for this universal error? If we have come "down from perfection into imperfection," and this is a "fall," who caused us to come down? If our moral evil is due to a lack of "social science and social control," ignorance and weakness of the will, who is responsible here? Any one might well be pardoned for discussing the subject of sin without any reference to its insurmountable difficulties. But to try to escape them by dressing sin up as "'lack of social control" and naming it "error" and hope to escape through a break in the wall while the sentries are asleep amounts to a confession that one is hard beset, with trickery rather than attack as the only and last available resort.

VI

Of those who see and frankly acknowledge the practically insurmountable difficulties met in any rationalistic explanation of the cause of sin I select our own lamented, clear-thinking Dr. Singmaster to give them expression:

> The fact and the guilt of sin are quite evident. The human spirit sighs for deliverance from its bondage and wonders why a good and omnipotent God allowed it to enter the universe to mar His handiwork. The suggestion is intolerable that God may be charged with the responsibility for the existence of moral evil. Such a thought is forbidden by the nature of an infinite

25 A. E. Haydon, *The Quest of the Ages* (New York, 1929), p. 144.

being, whose name is love, as well as by the immeasurable sacrifice which He has made in the gift of Christ for human redemption. We may be sure that God has permitted evil and its possibility for some ultimate wise purpose, however inscrutable that may be to us..... It seems then that evil is a possibility in a finite free being who passes through the discipline involved in the power of choice. The first man had the power not to sin, but in fact he did sin. The responsibility rests with him or the one who tempted him. One naturally inquires why the Omniscient should have created beings entrusted with powers they are liable to abuse. The answer is difficult, if not altogether impossible. We must rest in the knowledge that what God has done is good and good only. We must wait until it shall please Him to make it plain.[26]

Our article was called into existence, as we learned, in order to defend the leaders of Lutheranism from the charge of a predestinarian bondage of the will with its implications as to the cause of sin. Of the former, Luther once said: "Concerning predestination, it is best to begin below at Christ, as then we both hear and find the Father; for all those who have begun at the top have broken their necks. I have been thoroughly plagued and tormented with such cogitations of predestination; I would needs know how God intended to deal with me. But at last, God be praised! I clean left them; I took hold again on God's revealed word. Higher I was not able to bring it, for a human creature can never search out the celestial will of God ..... It is sufficient for us to learn and know Christ in his humanity, in which the Father has revealed himself."[27] Again, Luther, in a letter to the Christians at Antwerp (1525) wrote touching the same thing as follows: "God has forbidden sin and does not will it. This has been revealed and is necessary to know. But how God can ordain sin over a man (in cases like Pharaoh), this we shall not know, because He has not revealed it."[28]

Here we shall rest our case. Revelation furnishes us with only a partial explanation. It is, however, all that we possess. At the end of our long quest among the rationalistic theories of men,

26 J. A. Singmaster, *A Handbook of Lutheran Theology* (Philadelphia; United Lutheran Publication House), p. 156.

27 J. W. Richard, *The Formative Principle of Protestantism*, p. 3.

28 J. Neve, *Introduction to the Symbolical Books of the United Lutheran Church*, p. 297.

we find ourselves still within the confines of doorless walls. We have spent our utmost strength in an effort to batter them down, only to be thrown backward helpless and forlorn. Experience still asserts the fact of sin. Psychology traces the working of sin. Conscience points to the guilt of sin. Religion warns against the punishment of sin. Christ offers a relief from the sting of sin. The great sorrowful world is calling you and me to assist, by means of his Gospel, to lift the burden of sin. This should be enough for the life which we now live in this flesh of sin, having the assurance that Jesus has suffered for us the wages of sin, and that there awaits for us, if we are cleansed from sin, a heaven and a home which is forever free from sin. The restless reason of man cannot pierce the walls which here hedge him in. But on the wings of faith he may surmount their height and rest at ease on the eternal purposes and promises of God.

THE FIELD OF PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY

H. D. HOOVER
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

THE First International Congress on Mental Hygiene was held in Washington, D. C., May 5-10, 1930. No less than forty-three nations of the world took part in this great gathering. Leading scientists, educators, social workers, medical men, ministers and statesmen participated. A conference on such a gigantic scale is an index to the widespread contemporary interest in mental health. This is not a recent movement. The ancients were interested in beings suffering from mental ill-health. They made some of the afflicted individuals gods. They reduced others to the level of demonic possession.

Thinkers in all fields of endeavor have interested themselves in the phenomenon of mental derangement and abnormality. Historians and biographers, psysicians, philosophers, students of religion, statesmen, theologians, educators, and in these recent days psychologists, psychiatrists, social welfare workers of all kinds, and pastors have attacked the problems of mental ill-health. Some have approached the subject from the practical end. Others have dealt with the theoretical side. The record of case-studies in these later years has brought the subject into the scientific realm of reliable analysis and exact classification.

Religious leaders have ministered to individuals in mental ill-health for many years. Sometimes abnormal mental states have been mistaken for religion or religious exhibitions. More often these pathological cases have been handled as a departure from normal religious belief and practice and too often considered the objects of judgment and discipline instead of sympathy and healing.

The very close relation between physical and mental health has also complicated the situation. Many a poor soul has traveled

through the valley of shadows misunderstood and unhelped by unintelligent religious shepherding. Just recently a case illustrative of this fact came to my attention. A lady who was suffering deep mental anguish came to her pastor. She believed she was condemned to eternal torment. She was convinced that she had committed the unpardonable sin. Nothing that was said to her or done for her could relieve her mind or comfort her heart. To have continued dealing with the case from the mental standpoint alone would have been useless. For it was discovered that she was suffering from goitre. After the operation and partial recovery of bodily strength, her mind was as cheerful and as free from the obsession that she had sinned away the day of grace as any other trusting child of God. Before the days of good diagnosis and surgery such a soul would have eked out a miserable existence. No pastoral ministry could have cured her mental aberration created by physical disease. Yet there are innumerable cases where the attempt was made to discipline such a mind into normalcy.

MODERN NEEDS AND PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY

Pastors have been called on in these days to give more attention to this problem of mental ill-health because the conditions of life aggravate the trouble and emphasize the helplessness of the individual so afflicted. When life was largely rural and simple, when demands of society were few and the activities of workers confined mostly to handicraft, the social whole could absorb a considerable number of individuals of underdeveloped or defective minds. Society cannot do so now without inviting delay, obstruction and disaster. Besides, the pace of present day living emphasizes the perils and poverty of mental defectives who are permitted to assume the duties and responsibilities of citizenship in an age of terrific speed and concentrated power.

Mental defectives and sufferers are not only helpless driftwood in modern society, they are grave danger spots. Furthermore their poverty is enhanced by the advancing standards. Still further, their defects challenge science and religion to cure.

Of course the effort to heal the body and minister to the mind of man is not new to science or religion. The ministry of healing has been a part of the Christian program from the beginning. It has been difficult throughout its history to prevent quackery and magic on the one hand and materialism on the other. But religion has always neglected a part of its mission when it has failed to render the service of healing.

For a time this service was rendered directly by the ministers of the church. Then came the time when it was rendered exclusively by medical and mental science. It appears the day has come when pastors and physicians, psychiatrists and official priests are to coöperate sympathetically and effectively in a ministry of healing that will bring great blessings to humanity.

The minister is not only compelled to give attention to this problem of mental pathology because of the appeal for help by actual cases, but because of the recognition of his duty to minister to the whole man. It must be recognized that it is useless to "preach" to minds that are not functioning properly because of disease. The pastor is not "ministering" when he is dealing with an individual in spiritual distress by applying the salve of sincere advice to a patient who needs a careful psychopathic analysis and psychiatric treatment. The efficient pastor realizes that it is an untruth to call mental disease sin as much as it is to call sin mental ill-health. We set up a complicated and marvelously constructed machinery and procedure to maintain the smooth and harmonious working of a church organ, for example; we can afford to do no less to preserve and produce the harmonious functioning of the mind of parishioners. Yet, please note, the pastor renders his great service not by becomig a psychologist, a physician, or a psychiatrist. He looses his position of advantage with the mental patient when he does so. His great service is to be rendered in coöperation with these experts, but he is effective only as he remains the pastor, the man of God, who inspires confidence in the patient by the very fact that he is God's minister.

Dabbling in psychiatry, in psychotherapy and other fields re-

quiring the services of experts is not only dangerous and disastrous; it is untrue to the ideals and office of the ministry. Ignoring the great call to coöperate with these scientific benefactors of mankind and being indifferent to the challenge to fit oneself so to coöperate in the service of redeeming humankind from suffering, defects and disaster is unbecoming the pastor called of God to be a shepherd of the flock. But again it should be noted that some pastors may be fitted to perform this service to mental patients, while others may lack the personality or aptitude for this field of endeavor. Many should be informed and become aware of this field of work. A few should become experts; and a goodly number effective shepherds of the lame lambs in coöperation with psychotherapists, and physicians.

The psychiatrist, psychotherapist and the physician need to learn, as many of them have already acknowledged, that their patients have need of the pastoral ministry. Pastors need to fit themselves to coöperate effectively with these professional men. The eminent physician, Dr. John Rathbone Oliver writes that when a seminarian or young priest "asks me for a satisfactory book on psychasthenia, phobias, psychoanalysis, psychotherapy, etc., I am too often forced to put into his hand a book written by a man whose outlook is purely materialistic if not distinctly anti-religious." The same authority also says: "A physician cannot, in dealing with his mental patients, force upon them his own personal religious attitude. It is far easier for the priest or the minister who has a working knowledge of psychopathology to deal with perplexed and fearful individuals from a religious standpoint." He also believes that some of the books to be listed below are "approaching simple methods of psychotherapy from the standpoint of the Christian religion," and thus meeting a great need.

The remarkable cures that have been wrought in body and in mind are a challenge to every one who seeks to minister to man. We may speak of the regeneration of the mind, and of the body, as well as of the soul. This fact together with the great need of

such service, and the benign blessing of such cures of sick minds may account for the universal interest in this matter.

SUGGESTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note for example the many articles which appear in our contemporary magazines. Some of these are unreliable, some puerile. And no doubt there are dangerous quacks and dabblers engaged in psychotherapeutic undertakings. But it is rather easy to distinguish between the scientific and quackery. Consider also the following bibliography. This limited list is suggestive of the nature of this movement which has achieved a remarkable degree of coöperation between science and religion, at least between scientific workers and ministers of the church.

Einführung in die Psychotherapie für Pfarrer, by Johann Neumann of Giessen. This is a call for the coöperation of religion and professionals in the task of producing a healthier society.

Psychology in the Service of the Soul, by Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead of England. Let the author state what he hopes to achieve by this book in his own words: "(1) To show some distressed men and women who are in a very dark wood that some of us believe there is a path through it and that we can help them find it. (2) To suggest to some ministers prepared to slog hard for half a dozen years that becoming true, efficient, and understanding physicians of souls they can do a work which the Master of life needs doing. (3) To suggest to any physicians and psychotherapists who may read this book that there is a field for coöperation with the suitably trained minister in many cases where the origin of the trouble is a disharmony of soul. (4) To suggest incidentally to the man with 'leanings towards Christian Science' that all that is of value in that system can be preserved and used without recourse to the bewildering metaphysics of Mrs. Eddy. (5) To suggest to the reader to whom the new psychology is suspect that there is nothing unclean in it, that Freudian methods can be applied without every detail of the Freudian point of view being accepted, and that the aim of practical psychology is that of the New Testament—which contains in other language so much of what is valuable in the new psychology—namely the facing up to life bravely, and the making of it that vigorous, radiant, confident, healthful thing God meant it to be."

Psychologische Seelsorge, by Dr. H. March. In this work the physician seeks to further coöperation between the professional and the pastor in the field of medical psychology.

Willst du Gesund Werden? by Pastor G. Diettrich of Reformationskirche

in Berlin. "A practical demonstration of the possibility of combining psychotherapeutic measures with gospel methods of pastoral care."

The Soul in the Making, an introduction to Pastoral psychology, by John G. MacKenzie, Prof. of Sociology and Psychology, Paton College, Nottingham.

The Human Mind, by Karl A. Menninger, a rather inconclusive report upon a laboratory experiment, or series of experiments. Very interesting and suggestive of an avenue of approach to a valuable human service; but one fraught also with dangerous consequences, if unscientifically handled.

Human Intelligence, by Dr. Arnold Lorand, the rather famous physician of Carlsbad, Czecho-Slovakia. This guide to rational thinking seeks to present the means of enhancing human intelligence by hygienic and therapeutic means.

The Human Body, by Dr. Clendenning, a work which while dealing with the bodily organisms, yet because of its recurring emphasis upon mental hygiene may be said to be a commentary on the Roman saying: "Mens sana in copore sano."

The Soul Comes Back, by Prof. Coffin of Whittier College. This is the account of a sincere attempt, more or less unsatisfactory, to clear up some of the distressing but needless mental suffering in the realm of religious belief and intelligence or the lack of it, mislabeled.

Recreating the Individual, by Hinkle.

Human Nature in the Making, by Prof. William E. Hocking of Harvard. A classical work.

The Foundations of Mental Health, by Dr. Leonardo Bianchi, late Professor of Nervous Mental Diseases in the Royal University of Naples. This great expert in nervous and mental diseases has here presented the conclusions of a lifetime of professional experience in teaching and in the public service of developing the principles of eugenics and mental hygiene as a means of combatting racial degeneration, and in paving the way for the advance of humanity along the upward road of social welfare and genuine progress.

Religion and Morbid Mental States, by Dr. H. I. Schou (M.D.), Head of the Hospital for Mental Diseases, Dianaland, Denmark. This book is the outgrowth of an attempt on the part of this famous specialist to instruct priests and theological students in the University of Copenhagen in the relation between religious soul-life and morbid mental states, and to furnish a guide to the clergy on the spiritual treatment of mental cases.

There are many other books on the subject. Books like James' *Varieties of Religious Experience* may be used to furnish material for this study.

I should also mention a recent book-of-the-month in mental hygiene: *The Healthy Mind,* by Henry B. Elkind, M.D. This is a suggestive manual of mental hygiene for adults.

Religion and Psychotherapy, a splendid work by Dr. W. M. Brown.

DANGER OF UNSCIENTIFIC METHODS

It should be stated that considerable meddling and bungling and even buncombe are practiced in the name of science or religion or both that are neither scientific nor religious. These efforts may be but a continuation of bad practices in the past, or ill-advised departures of overzealous but unfitted and unprepared repair gangs of human faults and ills.

It should also be added that all psychiatrists, physicians, penologists, sociologists and psychologists, both pastoral and didactic, recognize the fact that research and service in this field are developing very slowly; that the methods are being improved rapidly; and that great care will have to be exercised in the development of method and technique. Perhaps the most impressive thing about it all is the great harm that may be done by improper methods, or treatment, or in the diagnosing, interpretation and classifying of cases.

It is astonishing, on the other hand, what progress has been made by the mental hygiene movement. Twenty-one years ago the Connecticut Society for Mental Hygiene was formed; and the following year, 1910, was born the National Committee for Mental Hygiene. It was the leadership of this organization and the splendid coöperation of professional people from more than forty countries that made possible the First International Congress on Mental Hygiene at Washington, D. C., last May. This was the first concerted effort to outline a world program of mental health and mental disease prevention.

THE CO-OPERATIVE TASK

This may be in the process of becoming international, but it certainly is one of inter-relatedness. No sooner is a movement born than it relates itself, rightly or wrongly, to every major interest of the individual and society.

Just a glance at the field of mental hygiene reveals the interesting exhibit that the question of mental health is relating itself,

at the present time, to education, general and technical, particularly adult education, religion, including theological education, religious education, pastoral service and foreign missions, psychiatry and psychiatric social welfare work, medicine in education and practice, legislation, the courts and the ministry of justice, including delinquency and penology, industry and occupational therapy, vocational guidance, public health and hygiene, urban administration and other phases of civics, nursing, life insurance, marriage and divorce (including sex problems), scholarship and scholarships, clinics and research, eugenics, anthropology including subnormal and handicapped individuals and racial degeneration and progress. It has even broken into the field of philanthropy. For the National Committee on Mental Hygiene has become a beneficiary of the Hubert Legacy administered by Calvin Coolidge, Julius Rosenwald and Alfred E. Smith.

The pastor and religious leader has been thrust into the necessity of dealing with mental health and disease by numerous abnormal individuals and situations. Witness a pastor's testimony in answer to the question: "What was your strangest pastoral experience?"

After the Sunday evening service, he was approached by a man, seeking guidance, and asking for a private interview. The pastor asked him to come to the church office. All others had left the building; even the janitor was released by the kindly pastor. As soon as they were alone, the man drew a vicious looking gun from his clothes and stated his case thus:

"Reverend, I am a lost soul. I have come to you to save my soul. If you cannot convince me that I am saved tonight, I will first kill you and then blow out my own brains."

The pastor recognized the insanity of his patient. But that did not relieve the seriousness of his predicament. He tried drawing out the man. But he would not talk. He was there to be convinced by the pastor, not to give time-wasting information. The minister began quoting scripture, quietly and as soothingly and as cheerfully as possible. When he had reached a certain

stage he suggested they kneel in prayer. He made one condition, that the patient repeat the words of the prayer after the pastor. In the midst of the procedure, the soothed man jumped up and cried: "I'm saved, I'm saved," and, raving on, rushed from the room and the building. The pastor never saw him again; and didn't have much desire to meet him.

The numerous mentally diseased and obsessed persons who inflict themselves upon a pastor have demanded of him an intelligent skill and a method of ministry that will meet their need. In the past many of these deluded persons were thought to be very religious, or possessed of demons. We now know that approximately all of them were not only denuded of religion but also that their health of mind demanded a religion they did not have.

In some cases the insight and sympathy of the superior pastor led him to seek a way to minister to the mentally diseased or handicapped. But the entrance of the clergy into coöperation with the physician and the psychiatrist has been from no other cause than the mutual recognition of the value and necessity of such coördination of effort. Dr. Schou points out that there is a very close relation between the religious soul-life and the mental states of an individual; that materialistic medical men and mental specialists cannot successfully deal with mental patients, any more than impractical clergy who ignore the principles of psychiatry can be safe or efficient religious advisers. The patient needs both psychiatrist and pastor. And these have made a beginning in intelligent coöperative service.

Freud in his introduction to Pastor Pfister's *Psychoanalytic Method* says: "In a number of cases results will only come from mutual coöperation of educator and physician." And again, "The educator and pastor being habitually associated with youth makes them better suited to have sympathetic insight into the mental life of this class of persons." And further: "One could conceive that such a psychoanalytic activity on the part of the educator and the pastor might afford invaluable assistance and often render the intervention of the physician superfluous." "The approach to the field of mental abnormalities will compel the analyzing educator to

make himself familiar with the most exact psychiatric knowledge and to take the physician into consultation where diagnosis and outcome of the disturbance may appear doubtful." And another commenting on this attitude of Freud writes: "No psychotherapist goes far into the depths of his patient's trouble without coming up against moral and spiritual difficulties; indeed, in not a few cases the symptoms relate to spiritual difficulties, as to the loss of the Holy Spirit, the loss of spiritual interests, or the feeling of being 'lost.'" Then speaks a pastor out his experience:

> There can be no doubt that in all cases of moral disease the moral and spiritual prestige of the pastor or analyst has great influence, and makes possible the power of suggestion which enters into every method of analysis. Especially is this true when dealing with the difficulties of the adolescent, or in cases of anxiety neuroses, although it is true for all cases also. Not seldom the only help that one can give until one has found the root of the trouble is to tap whatever religious faith the person has, and that can only be done effectively by one who has faith.

WHAT THE MINISTER SHOULD KNOW

The need of ministers trained in pastoral psychology and psychiatry is real. The minister needs to know enough to recognize to some degree of accuracy cases of mental diseases, nervous diseases and mental disturbance and abnormality. Spiritual advisers are called on almost constantly to deal with pathologically abnormal cases. What to do and how, as well as when not to undertake a case is very important. The helpful minister knows how to relate his work and his patients to medical authority, to the psychologist and the psychiatrist.

1. First mentioned should be the growing recognition of the difficulties that arise in society, in industry, in education and in religion from the fact that people grow up physically but not mentally and emotionally. The modern minister is intensely interested in the development of Christian persons who are adults in every sense of the word.

2. Let us face the fact of an immense amount of needless mental suffering. "There are few forms of suffering so hard to

bear as those imposed upon a human being in a state of mental depression. There are few pains so intense as those of the mind; they are far worse than bodily pain." A great many people are torturing themselves with religious obsessions, accusations, fears and reproaches. They are robbed of joy, of efficiency, of bodily health because of these mental afflictions. In many cases this is not because they have sinned; they are sick. They are not tortured by the devil; they are afflicted with real disease.

3. The guidance of youth in a wholesome religious development toward a vigorous spiritual maturity is an art which requires an adequate knowledge of the principles of mental health; and some acquaintance with the symptoms of mental disorders—sufficient at least to prevent or irradicate the tendency to mental ill-health, to recognize pathological conditions and to know to whom to refer the same for treatment.

Dr. Fosdick and many other ministers have been practicing psychotherapy, though some prefer the designation "autognosis" as the proper term. But the method is simply "an attempt to get into clear consciousness the processes, conscious, subconscious, or unconscious, that have become disturbing factors in the physical, mental or moral life of the person concerned."

Referring to cases of patients whose symptoms have defied all medical prescriptions and treatments, "the older school of doctors were apt to lose patience and tell such a patient that his pain and his symptoms were all imaginary." But, observes Dr. MacKenzie, "an imaginary pain is a contradiction in terms; if we think we have a pain we have one; it is a psychological impossibility to imagine one. Imagination may induce one, but that is a different matter; we then have to look for the disease of the imagination which produces the symptoms." And he follows with an illustration from his pastoral experience:

> I was asked to see a boy who was not doing well at school. He had got into his school with a scholarship and then somehow his ability seemed to depart; he lost his power of concentration, and was taking a far lower place in the class than he ought to have done; and illness was frequent. At the beginning of the term he was invariably ill, mostly biliousness and 'nervous-

ness.' His doctor could find nothing physically wrong. It was not difficult to find that the boy who had been invariably at the top in the elementary class was unconsciously shrinking from the sterner competitions among boys of his own mental calibre; and there was a strong tendency to phantasy achievements instead of the hard work needed for achievement. There were also homosexual tendencies. The boy was really clever, but had been rather made too much of by female teachers in the elementary school. I saw the boy about six times; he steadily regained his place and his interest in his work. He realized what was happening and has given no more bother either as to illness or place in the school form. There are many such cases where the minister and doctor can coöperate.

4. Social workers generally and pastors particularly are cognizant of the great amount of maladjustment in the industrial, social, domestic and other spheres of life. The Christian minister simply cannot undertake his great mission to humanity in industrial centers with any hope of accomplishing it if ignorant of at least an elementary knowledge of the science of mental health and its relation to healthy religion, and vice versa.

5. The perpetuation of psychopathic mental states and their substitution for religion, and particularly for the Christian religion is unthinkable in this enlightened era. It is not sufficient that the Christian ministry recognize the evil and denounce it. As religious leaders they have come to assume their responsibility and privilege to labor with the scientist in psychiatry, psychology and medicine as sentinels of scientific and social progress and to serve as benefactors who do all within their power to remove hindrances and realize the utmost possibilities of the improvement of mankind. Of course "the pastor can scarcely become a specialist in the more severe moral conflicts which demand the care of an analyst or psychotherapist; but he will have knowledge enough to know that such a case needs special treatment and where to send him."

DEVELOPING A TECHNIQUE

No technique has been developed to date in the preparation of theological candidates for such intelligent coöperative service in the realm of mental health. A number of the theological schools are giving serious attention to the matter. Parenthetically it may be

mentioned that a number of schools of theology are employing psychiatrists to examine candidates for admission.

Some progress has been made however. There are now on record a great many case studies of children, youths and adults. These studies and personal guidance of cases have been made by pastors, psychiatrists, teachers, physicians and social experts. Instruction is being given in Europe and America to theological candidates and to priests and clergy in this subject. Several excellent books and many treatises have been written. And a number of individuals have undertaken projects. Some of these have met with astonishing success. A limited amount of clinical work has been done both on the side of preparation and in the field of service.

Among the theological schools doing research work under well formulated plans are Chicago Theological Seminary, Union, and Yale Divinity School. The first mentioned located a member of its teaching staff at the State Hospital for the insane at Worcester, Mass. I listened with great interest to Prof. Boisen describing his work. In addition to his research and study of individual cases, he undertook two lines of activity. He guided and instructed a group of men selected from the student body of Chicago Theological Seminary in making observations of pathological cases. These selected students spent a year of clinical work in the institution, learning the technique of caring for the patients as internes and attendants. After six months of such service, much of it menial, and the directed observation and study, there was another careful selection from the student internes. Each of these few clinic students was then given full charge of an individual case for the next six months, or until discharged from the institution. In a few cases, as I remember, the student remained in charge of the patient after discharge from the institution and during the period and process of adjustment to life and its relations.

The report to the American Sociological Society by Prof. Boisen was made a few years ago. The technique of such clinical and research work has been improved and modified since then.

Many teachers of pastoral theology, or pastoral psychology, are using carefully gathered personal-experience material and case-records. A few are finding it possible to develop students to the point where they are able to handle pathological cases as clinical studies.

There are on record the accounts of service rendered by pastors who have assumed the guidance of pathological cases while carrying on their duties as ministers of churches or pastorates. One city church has established a mental clinic with a pastor and a staff of workers in charge. Another example is that of a pastor in a middle western state who undertook the direction of the pathological case of a patient whose mental disease led the victim to conduct that was classified as criminal. The pastor did not receive the patient until after a prison experience. The rehabilitation of this young man reads like a romance. The story of his restoration to a respected place in the civic, social, economic and religious life of the community is merely the record of his recovery of mental health. The details of the case seem to exhibit the vital service which religion can contribute to such recovery. The pastor was specially prepared for this service by a year's interneship in a hospital for the insane under the expert guidance and instruction of medical and professional religious leadership.

A limited number of capable pastors have by the use of personal conferences and consultation periods rendered expert guidance to psychopathics, and normal persons in temporary mental distress or ill-health. This is a scientific organization of the confessional idea.

Theological candidates are being taught to observe individuals suffering from mental or nervous ill-health in order thus to learn human nature. In these morbid states certain human traits are emphasized and are more easily isolated and studied. Students are being guided to observe human life as it is.

IMPORTANCE IN TRAINING PASTORS

The subject of mental pathology is particularly pertinent to

the studies preparatory to the pastoral office for very definite reasons.

1. A large number of the people requiring the attention and counsel of the pastor are mentally abnormal; some are psychopathics.

2. The close relation between religion and mental ill-health. "That religion drives people mad is an assertion often heard, especially when one has, as a doctor, occasion to talk with insane persons and their relatives. We often hear, when a person has been admitted to a lunatic asylum, observations of this sort: 'My wife has gone mad; it was all through going to those meetings and to church'; or, 'My daughter was always one of the holy sort, and it seems to have turned her brain.' "

The reports of state mental asylums of Denmark, however, exhibit the following common causes of insanity:

Hereditary tendencies	40%
Abuse of alcohol	5
Arteriosclerosis	4
Climacteric	3
Physical disease	5
Syphilis	10

Among the causes more rarely found, Dr. Schou mentions:

Overexertion	½%
Emotional strain	5
Economic difficulties	1
Religious influence	½ to 1

Thus "religious influence is, according to the view of modern psychiatrists, a rare, a very rare cause of insanity."

The reason why so many think religion is a cause of insanity is a confusion of cause and effect. Religious ideas are extraordinarily frequent among insane persons. Religious ideas as a class are more frequently found in asylums than any other, except that they are sometimes rivaled by those of a sexual character.

Authorities, however, note the relation between religion and morbid mental states. Professor Oppenheim, in his book *Nervenleidung und Erziehung* says, "From my experience as a medical

man, I reckon lack of faith as one of the most regrettable qualities. It seems to me that religion offers a strong, albeit by no means certain, support in the struggle against those powers which attack the nervous system. A strong and firm faith is a safeguard against most of the emotions which the vicissitudes of life call forth in those lacking this support."

A well-known authority on mental disease, Dr. Kraft-Ebing, writes: "We may assume that true religion, true ethical sense, ennobles the human spirit and directs it toward something higher, affords comfort in adversity, and will reduce the danger of insanity."

Dr. J. L. A. Kock, of the mental asylum of Zweifaden, observes: "In so far as it is possible at all to render mental life more resistant to harm through the nervous system, there is at any rate to begin with, no other means but a certain resignation. And I will not conceal my opinion that the persons most capable of resistance to mental disturbance are those whose safeguard arises out of a living religious feeling."

"Dr. Hyslop, principal medical officer at the Bethlem Mental Asylum, in London, considers that constant simple prayer must be granted the foremost place among the hygienic precautions which can counteract mental disturbance, depressed state of mind, and all the consequences of mental distress."

Dr. P. D. Koch writes: "I cannot, from my own experience, quote a single case where religious influence or emotion has given rise to insanity. And I am speaking from an experience of something like a couple of thousand cases of insanity, of whom I have had close personal knowledge in my private practice, and this, moreover, particularly among religious people."

Yet religious crises and experiences may and do cause insanity in persons predisposed toward it. It is one of the psychogenous psychoses. Such, says one medical authority, should be surrounded "with a spirit of Christianity" under the care of those "who understand their calling, and its responsibilities, and spare no pains to treat them in the spirit of Jesus Christ." The treatment

of insane patients, he continues, should be the "concordia" of physical therapy and spiritual therapy.

3. The presence of religious ideas and aberrations in the insane suggests also several other considerations. First the fact that in a Christian community people are imbued, more or less, with religious ideas from childhood. Mental trouble merely reveals the presence of unsuspected depths and plentitude of religious ideas. Such cases may testify to the operation, though far from the adequacy of, religious training.

Again these religious ideas may be a mass of unassimilated mental forms, used as sort of mystic charm in trouble. This would furnish testimony to the tragic deficiency in religious education.

But perhaps the explanation in the majority of mental diseases is that "religious life becomes powerful and violent in psychosis, because it is a primitive thing, a primitive tendency, a natural inclination, an instinctive craving, which may be suppressed in many people in everyday life, but in psychosis breaks forth strongly and violently, inflexibly and uncontrollably, resembling in this respect the sex instinct and the craving for food." Whether further study will confirm this theory or not, the fact remains that pastoral psychology is attacking this and related problems in earnest.

It is seeking a technique of ministry to counteract the hyperchondriac fixed ideas and self-reproaches of melancholia. It is seeking the spiritual treatment appropriate to maniac exaltation, suffering from pathological ebullitions of feeling. It is seeking a means of ministry to the chronic and incurable psychoses: patients suffering from paranoia and hallucinations; and it matters not whether the patient considers himself the Prophet of the Most High or His Satanic Majesty.

PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY AND EVERY DAY LIFE

However, we should banish the suggestion that pastoral psychology is chiefly concerned with spiritual service to the insane. It is not. Its chief field of investigation and service lies in the realm of the everyday life of everyday people of every road. It

has to do with people who are considered sane. It is preparing ministers to deal with a large number of people who are suffering from mental disorders that are bringing distress or preventing wholesome living, or hindering the development of a full, rich maturity of life. And the study of extreme cases, as the insane, is done to gather information for use in preventing mental disease, and in correcting minor abnormalities.

Space prevents the presentation of much interesting material from the experience of technically trained pastoral experts in mental health. It is to be hoped that the reader's interest in this live question will not be hindered by this inadequate presentation. No book today is expected to contain final and finished truth on its subject; therefore much less a brief article.

It is to be hoped, however, that sufficient has been said to indicate that the pastoral office has left behind the function of purposeless social "calling"; that it has moved forward from the mere eleemosynary service of smoothing the troubled waters of an ecclesiastical organization, that the modern pastor in this, as well as in the prophetic, the administrative and the instructional phases of his service, has progressed toward creative functioning in friendly coöperation with other scientific benefactors of mankind.

BOOK REVIEWS

WHAT IS LUTHERANISM?[1]

One thing this reviewer will not do, and that is attempt another reply, in addition to the eleven contained in this book, to the question which forms its title. The interesting volume consists of an Introduction on the Lutheran church in general and of eleven essays on the theme proposed for discussion, the last by the editor himself. If the essayists had written their papers altogether on their own motion, perhaps some of them would have been different. But they had a task assigned to them. Not only were they asked to contribute articles on the theme but also to answer a scheme of questions proposed by the editor. Hence the track was marked out for them.

The plan was to get expressions from "Lutherans of different schools of opinion" in this country. However, the distribution of representatives of the different schools is not altogether equal. Of the eleven writers six are from the United Lutheran Church, two are from the Swedish Augustana Synod, and one each from the Norwegian, the Missouri and the Iowa body. Four of the writers are theological professors, five are college professors, one is a pastor and one is engaged in church administration. Notwithstanding the scheme of discussion suggested to them, the essayists have treated the subject with considerable independence of method and spirit. The discussions furnish the pleasure of variety and the zest of diversity. One treats of Lutheranism in a broad historical way as evangelical catholicity; another treats it historically in relation to prevailing tendencies and movements; still another treats it from the point of view of Reformation history as justification by faith with its implications. One exegetical professor views Lutheranism as an expression of scriptural, especially Pauline, faith. A college professor views it philosophically as an antithesis to current liberal thought. Another contributor wrote an apologetic for the Lutheran church; another discusses Lutheranism as a system of religious truth; still another treats it as an experience in religion and as an expression of Christian faith, mainly as a form of teaching; and one writer is puzzled to know "what on earth is Lutheranism anyhow," and ends by naming three characteristics, rather external, of the Lutheran church. A keenly analytical writer defines Lutheranism as that spiritual understanding of Christianity which the creative years of the Reformation produced, and emphasizes the "spiritual." In the concluding essay the

1 *What is Lutheranism? A Symposium in Interpretation.* Edited by Vergilius Ferm, Ph.D. New York: Macmillan Co., 1930. 307 pages. $2.50.

editor raises the question, how far Lutheranism can adjust itself to modern thought.

It is probably not a guess far wrong that the underlying motive for arranging the whole symposium is contained in the question just stated. At least the other motive which readily suggests itself, namely that of revealing how "Lutherans of different schools of opinion" might approach nearer to each other and even unite, does not seem to be in evidence. The purpose of the book seems to be to induce Lutherans to ask themselves the question, whether the times do not require that they shall give up some of their views and attitudes, received by tradition from their fathers, and adopt other opinions and attitudes, which shall bring them nearer to those who accept new interpretations of Christianity. One of the crucial questions, which the contributors were asked to consider, is: "What is meant by the 'Word of God'?" Luther sang: "Das Wort sie sollen lassen stahn," and the church which bears his name has ever sung it after him. Shall what has been understood by the Word of God since Luther, not to go back further, be perpetuated, or shall it, in the light of new intellectual constellations, be exchanged for something else more accordant to ideas current in this new day? Certainly this is a big question, a vital question. It should be faced with intellectual candor and considered with a conscience towards God as well as towards modern science. A living church should not be merely content with a traditional answer to such questions. After all, the question, What is Lutheranism? drives one back to the Bible. To find the answer to the question, it is not enough to go back to the religious experience of Luther, but it is necessary to go back to where Luther found what he possessed and gave. One is reminded here that, whatever the shortcomings of the theology of the seventeenth century were, it was not content to find the solution of its problems in Luther and the Lutheran confessions, however highly it esteemed both, but in the Holy Scriptures.

A. G. Voigt

An editor has accomplished what no church politician or diplomatist has hitherto achieved. He has brought together for a public discussion of the nature of Lutheranism representatives of several Lutheran bodies, including the United Lutheran Church, the Missouri Synod, the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, the Augustana Synod, and the Iowa Synod. This fact alone speaks volumes—at least one volume—for the character of Lutheranism. No church with a censor would place its *imprimatur* on a book conceived and carried out in the spirit of this one. I have been asked to review it for the readers of this publication,[2] which implies that I am expected to give my reac-

2 Prof. George M. Stephenson, Department of History, University of Minnesota, in *The Lutheran Companion,* June 21, 1930. Reprinted by permission of the author and of *The Lutheran Companion.*

tion to it, to evaluate it as a whole, and to interpret its spirit and content, doing justice and avoiding injustice to eleven individualistic contributions.

Taking into account the antecedents and synodical affiliations of the contributors to the symposium, their approach is surprisingly and refreshingly frank; but it is not difficult to detect their synodical environment and antecedents. The Augustana Synod men, Wendell and Ferm, are the freest of all; they let themselves go. More cautious and yet daring, are the former General Synod men, Wentz and Hefelbower. These four men have done graduate work at American universities. Of the other contributors (not including Weigle, who is no longer a member of the Lutheran church) only two have pursued studies in American institutions not affiliated with the Lutheran church, Haas and Rohne. The balance of them have confined themselves to American Lutheran institutions or to German universities or both, Evjen, Offerman, Reu, Scherer and Dau. Throughout, the discussion is on a high plane, free from polemic and insinuations, with honest differences of opinion and different approaches. In the terminology of the sixteenth century they might properly hurl the "You-are-of-another-spirit" reproach against each other, but they show themselves to be children of the twentieth century. This in itself is significant of a great transformation in American Lutheranism and prophetic of still greater changes. All but one stress the unity of the Lutheran church and tend to minimize differences, a circumstance explained by the fact that the one who does not sees with the eyes of the layman rather than the theologian.

Martin Luther is among friends, but some of them are brutally frank. By others he is pampered and petted. Reu and Haas find the key to the answer to the question as to the distinguishing mark of the Lutheran church in the study of Luther's character and experience; Ferm presents the great reformer as fallible, impulsive and self-contradictory. Both he and Wendell reject the "back to Luther" movement and ask "Which Luther?" They hurl his uncomplimentary words about certain portions of Scripture to batter down walls of biblical and confessional complacency. The name "Lutheran" as applied to a church fares no better. Some shy at it as an implication of sectarianism. The spokesman for Missouri (Dau) meticulously quotes Luther to prove that he opposed the use of his name to designate a movement or church.

With the exception of the Augustana Synod men, the contributors tiptoe through the labyrinth of the confessions. Some of them speak in whispers for fear of hearing their own voice—or is it out of fear that some one else will hear them? There seems to be a unanimous agreement that the symbols were prepared to meet a peculiar situation at a given time and that their validity is not dependent upon their mere fiat but upon agreement with the Word of God. To use a crude figure, the symbols are greenbacks, whose value is contingent upon the gold reserve deposited in the Scriptures. They have no

intrinsic value. The "General Synod" and the Augustana Synod men are even willing to admit that their value fluctuates, just as the greenbacks did during and after the Civil War. Hefelbower is bold enough to call attention to the fact that there is no such thing as the "Unaltered Confession"; that the text read before the Diet is not the one in use now and that what passes as the "Unaltered Confession" is already an altered form. How S. S. Schmucker would have relished this admission from a symbolist! All admit that the confessions are fallible, but a layman gives up in despair when "Missouri" delivers itself of the following: "A wholesale declaration that one accepts the Lutheran Confessions 'as far as' they agree with the Scriptures, not only throws suspicion on these Confessions, but also opens the door to doctrinal latudinarianism and insincerity." "There is no reason why any Lutheran in view of the new *isms* and vagaries of our time should think of revising the creed and doctrinal attitude of his Church. . . ." But some Lutherans (or at least they call themselves Lutherans) do. This is Ferm speaking: "The doctrine of the complete inerrancy of the Bible upon which historic Lutheranism has built up a system of orthodoxy can hardly, without a loss of intellectual integrity and vitality, be today maintained in the light of the historical method of understanding the Scriptures." He cites specific official declarations of Lutheranism that are no longer tenable. He even admits that Luther's position on the Eucharist may be fairly challenged as a necessarily true Biblical exegesis. He sees the inconsistency of Lutherans wearing the crown of infallibility which they deny to others.

Those contributors to the book who may properly be called symbolists are faced with the same dilemma that confronted Luther and the other reformers, namely, that of claiming for themselves the right of interpreting the Bible in the light of their own knowledge and religious experience and denying that right to others. The reformers hedged by asserting that their interpretation was the correct one. In these pages the identical position is somewhat diluted with the admission that what is needed is not a new creed but a new interpretation of it (Offerman); that new statements may be called for (Wentz); that Lutheranism is not static (Hefelbower); that Lutheranism makes a distinction between the Bible and the Word of God (Haas); that Bibliolatry is an exalted form of idolatry (Wendell); that Lutheranism has no fear of textual criticism (Reu and Haas); that the Lutheran church has an intelligent way of dealing with human reason (Rohne). May a layman inquire as to the fate of men who in the past have suggested the necessity of a new or modified creed? Let Schmucker and Waldenström answer.

An evaluation of the relative merits of the historical, theological, logical, and subjective approaches to the question "What is Lutheranism?" lies largely with the individual reader. He will find the four methods in these pages. In the opinion of the reviewer, the logical argument of Ferm is the most convincing and satisfying. He reveals a more profound ecumenical

spirit and is untrammeled by symbols and ecclesiasticism. Perhaps his present detached position partly accounts for this. He presents a most scholarly, bold, brilliant, and suggestive challenge and is the only contributor who constructs a platform, which includes six planks. His position and Wendell's are essentially the same. Both men accept the logic of the situation and accept the challenge of those who protest the name "Lutheran" by a willingness to surrender the name and organization, if necessary, to promote the unity of scattered groups of Christians.

Aside from the intellectual satisfaction derived from it, the book should be judged by its reaction upon men who find their spiritual home not only in some Lutheran church but in all churches of Christendom. It will also furnish a source for the future historian in search of the causes of division within the Lutheran church and the progress towards unity marked by it. The Unitarian will learn that the Lutheran church rejects "salvation by character"; that it takes sin "seriously" and makes a clear distinction between sin and morality; the Roman Catholic that it rejects "good works" as a means of salvation; the "modernist" that the "social gospel" is frowned upon as insufficient; the evangelicals in all churches that it shies at "unionism" and "fundamentalism" and leans towards a liturgical service, leaving room for variations or no liturgy at all; and that it is tied to no pattern of church architecture, ritual, vestments, etc.

The reagents applied to the symbols produce varied precipitates in the eleven test tubes, which indicates that Lutherans are not fettered. The book will raise many questions. Why has not the Lutheran church made a stronger impression in America? Has it emulated the example of Luther by appealing to the man on the college campus as well as to the man who tills the soil and tends the machine? Has it been true to the boast that Lutheranism was born in a university and has it understood that a university implies a reverent search for truth? Has it been conscious of the fact that the age-long question of whether creed forms character or character forms creed is still unanswered? Has it sought after a fundamental understanding why Lutheran creed-making ceased in the sixteenth century and why every effort to modify them has been rejected? Does it realize that the Lutheran church carries the seeds of its own destruction in the example of Luther, its deference to textual criticism, and the Introduction to the Formula of Concord which declares that with new light and a more adequate interpretation of the Scriptures changes in doctrine are necessary? Does the Lutheran church know that just as its symbols were colored by their time, their interpretation and rejection by certain synods was just as circumstantial? Inertia, indifference and scholarship have laid symbolism low in Scandinavia and Germany. What is in store for American Lutheranism, now that the synods have emerged from the chrysalis stage and are sending hosts of their youth to universities? The reviewer is sometimes tempted to think that the Augustana Synod, with all its provincial-

ism, has been more ecumenical than any other nationalistic Lutheran body, as its sojourn in the Synod of Northern Illinois and the General Council bears witness. Is this a result of the low ebb of nationalism in Sweden when immigration was at flood tide?

The United States has seen the birth of sectional political parties and national parties torn and split wide open by sectionalism. "Constitutionality" has often been a "talking point" to conceal sectional interests and rivalry. Is it heresy to suspect that "pure doctrine" has sometimes been a "talking point" to conceal nationalism within the Lutheran church? If the suspicion is well founded, perhaps the answer to "What is Lutheranism?" will be found when the pernicious epithets, "melting pot" and "hyphenated Americans," are remembered only as marking a stage in the process of weaving the fabric of American society.

GEORGE M. STEPHENSON

THE ATONEMENT FOR 1930

The Atonement in History and Life is a book of fourteen essays, by as many different writers.[1] The first ten trace the idea of Atonement through various historical periods. The last four discuss its place in life and thought. The underlying thesis of the volume is a defense of the "objective" view of the Atonement, as over against the more recent trend to interpret it simply as an act of love exerting a noble influence over men (the "subjective" view).

The first two essays, "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," by L. B. Cross (Oxford), and "The Contribution of the Prophets of Israel," by R. S. Cripps (Cambridge), give a great deal of preliminary insight into the growth of the whole demand that people place upon God—how the demand for special favors gave way to the conviction that life could be conquered by spiritual means. Mr. Cripps has a fine discussion of Isaiah 53, which stands as a monument in the growth of the principle of sacrifice. The third essay, "Atonement in Jewish Literature From 400 B. C. to A. D. 200," by A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., shows how, when religion was buried in formal sacrifices after the Exile, the Wisdom writers kept alive some of the divine fire by an insistence on righteousness, almsgiving, prayer, fasting—practices outside the ceremonial routine.

With the fourth essay, "The Atonement in the Synoptic Gospels," by A. J. Tait, D.D., the real discussion begins. Canon Tait searches the Synoptics thoroughly for every direct and indirect evidence that Jesus believed in subsequent theories of the Atonement. His own verdict is that the Synoptics do give a satisfactory foundation for such theories. The problem is fascinating,

1 Edited by the Rev. L. W. Grensted, M.A., B.D., Fellow and Chaplain of University College, Oxford. New York (Printed in Great Britain): Macmillan Co., 1929. 335 pages. $3.50.

of course, because the first three gospels, especially Mark, give us our most objective, disinterested, account of Jesus. Canon Tait's splendid, needle-in-the-haystack search for evidence would have convinced me of just the opposite from what he intends, had I not come to that conclusion long ago from my own informal survey. No one, I think, who cares to dismiss all bias from his mind, can doubt that the historical Jesus did not live and act with our Atonement ideas guiding him. If he had had any suspicion that the rich man, for instance, would suffer eternal misery in not following him, Jesus would certainly have told him so, plainly.

In "The Pauline View of the Atonement," by D. Dawson-Walker, D.D., we have an interesting sketch of St. Paul's belief and teaching about what Jesus accomplished in him. The account is excellent; but it never seems to occur to Dr. Dawson-Walker or any of the succeeding writers that the great value of Paul's thinking is to reveal to us his religious experience. The essayist cannot free himself from the notion that there is something intrinsically worth while in Paul's framework of philosophy. He does, indeed, refer to "St. Paul's *rationale* of the Cross" (page 144); but for the most part he treats of Paul's reasoning, and not of the experience he was trying to express. Englishmen are proverbially slow to see a joke; and I suppose it will be another two centuries before they perceive the last great joke, which is being recited in all back alleys of American intellectualism, of the nonsense of all a priori philosophies, except as descriptions of some fact or experience which was first received empirically. Dr. Dawson-Walker writes in a somewhat hurt way that some think that to understand Paul they must "strip the husk off of his particular presentment" of divine truth. Well, at least we can reassure him to this extent, that Paul's way of stating truth is no more a husk (far less, from many points of view) than the modern philosophies of Fichte, or Schopenhauer, or Bergson, or Kant (in his *Critique of Practical Reason*), or almost any of the philosophers except the modern empiricists. Paul took a remarkably fine way to say what he felt; we can appreciate the greatness, even of his logic, without demanding that it be forced into the minds of a generation which thinks in different terms. On page 151 the essayist writes: "Criticism .... has found a logical hiatus in his thinking, and has been unable to discover any necessary connection between an objective redemption, wrought by Christ, and subsequent growth in righteousness, on the part of the redeemed." Then: "For Paul, at any rate, the difficulty did not exist." Of course not; but why? Because to Paul the "subsequent" righteousness was the great bewildering initial experience; and the objective Atonement was the cogitation of his great mind to express what had happened to him. The connection in Paul was that between fact and its explanation.

What has been said above applies in the same way to the next chapter, "The Atonement in the Johannine Writings," by W. H. Rigg, D.D. Once again the writer gives us a most delightful study of John's presentation of the

Atonement; once again he can not free himself from trying to read the Johannine atmosphere into Jesus' own life. But is that necessary? Here was some one, doubtless the Apostle John, who was intimately associated with Jesus and received his great religious secret. He told the story of a friend who thought in terms of Gnostic (or some other) philosophy, and that person received the religious secret. Together (let us say) they projected our gospel of John, the apostle furnishing the remarkably accurate reminiscences of Jesus, the former philosopher trying to express the message of Jesus' life in the noblest, most expressive terminology he knew. Now obviously, if such may have been the origin of the Fourth Gospel, we neither have to read the Johannine circle of ideas into Jesus' own lips, nor dare we discard the Johanninism as useless. We must see in it the great way a great thinker took to let the world know what kind of man Jesus was, what kind of life he led, what sort of influence he exerted. Not a drop of the inspiration we have always found in that gospel is lost; yet we are not forced to violate our historical perspective. "The Synoptic representation of the Lord's death," says Dr. Rigg, page 170, "may seem to be at variance with the Johannine view of Christ dying for mankind." He solves the difficulty by showing that there is no necessary contradiction. But suppose there were; would it make any difference? The *universality* of the redemption of the Cross is not so much a tenet of Jesus' self-consciousness as it is the experience of the children of men from his day to ours. It is interesting to note that in discussing the Apocalypse, which Dr. Rigg does separately in the same essay, he is forced to use it to analyze Christian experience, simply because its historical envelope is so difficult to untangle. May be the very difficulties of Revelation will yet open to us a truer understanding of the meaning of the inspiration of the Bible!

The seventh essay, "The Atonement in Patristic Writings," by Harold Smith, D.D., traces the development of the doctrine in its rudimentary stages through Augustine. It is thus of more interest historically than doctrinally.

My greatest inspiration, in reading the volume, came with the eighth essay, "Anselm's Doctrine of the Atonement," by A. R. Whately, D.D. Whether it is Anselm's great thinking, or Dr. Whately's great thinking, that makes this chapter so meaty, I cannot positively say; but I think it is both. For just as Anselm stands almost halfway between Jesus and us in time, so his conception of God seems to be the exact identification of the God of Jesus and the picture of God which modern science is just about to explode upon us.

Anselm lived in an age when the world view was as nearly as possible identical with the church. In just a sentence, that fact gave him his marvelous understanding of God. For God represents the unity, or orderliness, of the whole universe of experience; and when, as in Paul's day or our own, great happenings and discoveries shake up the orderliness of the world for a while, the understanding of God becomes dimmed. Anselm had no such dif-

ficulty. He saw, in the middle of the only period since Jesus when all life was unified (in the Holy Roman Empire), the real nature of God; and seeing that, he realized how much effect God could have upon men: with these two axioms he worked out his doctrine of the Atonement. Christ died on the Cross to restore the honor, that is, the orderliness, or real nature, of God. Man's sin is not so very important of itself (this is the point in Anselm that is attacked); unrighteousness is negative; what Christ must do on the Cross is to get man into harmony with God again. Then man will be righteous without any effort at all.

So far as I can recall now, this religious viewpoint of Anselm's seems to me to be the nearest to that needed by our own age of any stated in the last thousand years. For when we turn to the next essay, "The Atonement in Reformation Theology," by V. J. K. Brook (Oxford), we come upon Luther's deep, soul-stirring religious experience, and his expressing it in what is here called the Penal Theory of the Atonement. Luther's experience was genuine; none of the other reformers, Mr. Brook points out, based their teachings on such a personal upheaval; nor, when we page through the succeeding essay, "The Atonement in Post-Reformation Writers," by E. C. Essex, do we find anything that reveals an experience of conversion, or personal atonement, that is more helpful than Luther's. But the trouble with Luther, for us, is just that he did wrestle so mightily with the problem of sin. The reason for that is that he found himself caught in between two ages—the medieval and the modern—the transition between which represents as violent a jerk as any in human history. Any man so caught is full of the most disturbing contradictions; and if he lives without the insight of psychology as such, he describes his feelings (to himself as well as to others) as objective sins. Now it is a curious thing that great religious geniuses who are placed in such contradictory environments, get things beautifully straightened out for themselves in their religious experience of new birth, but seem to bequeath to their followers a burdensome sense of sin as a terrific reality; and their followers innocently spend the next few centuries talking about the terrible sin which in the meantime has dropped out of the social horizon because the age has become somewhat unified again.

When I said geniuses, above, I was thinking, in addition to Luther, of St. Paul. He also shows the conflict of two entirely different environments—the old Jewish and the world Roman—and has the same drastic struggle with sin. He also found out, as did Luther, that to do right is simple and easy, much easier than to sin, when the "metanoia" or "change of mind" has been made Godward, and the soul's perplexities are straightened out. But he again, like Luther, left his conviction of sin for his interpreters to worry over, and they have certainly made the most of it.

So today our sincere religious leaders are still preoccupied with sin. The conclusion of Mr. Essex's chapter on post-Reformation writers, in which he

states his own eight reasons for deeming the death of Christ necessary, sounds to me exactly like what I ignorantly thought was the view of Anselm's eleventh century; while (as I said above) Anselm's views sound to me like what I fain would have hoped for from Mr. Essex in the twentieth century. This essayist, and his colleagues in the book, are contending for the reality, or objectivity, of the Atonement; and one and all they seem to feel that it depends on the tremendous reality of sin. Doubtless that is good Paulinism and good Lutheranism; but it is not Anselmian, nor, I believe, inherent in the religion of Jesus himself.

The four concluding essays in the book illustrate this preoccupation of the devout moderns with sin. In "Atonement and the Problem of Evil," C. F. D'Arcy, D.D., writes logically and brilliantly, and helpfully; but is obsessed with the awfulness of his Evil. The editor of the volume, L. W. Grensted, contributes the twelfth essay, "The Atonement in Personal Experience," devout, searching, but stressing a sense of sin which the modern viewpoint has taken away from the modern man. The last two essays, "The Atonement and Some Tendencies of Modern Thought: A Sermon with an Introductory Essay," by C. J. Shebbeare (Oxford), and "The Preaching of the Cross," by C. M. Chavasse, are the most medieval (that is, what I had assumed was medieval!) of all. The former of the two is interesting because of a resume of Karl Barth's confused intuitions, which Mr. Shebbeare likes because Barth minimizes natural righteousness. But both these essayists are worrying their theological minds over a deep conviction of sin which has simply evaporated out of the consciousness of men today.

What then has become of sin, or the consciousness of sin? From the ascetic atmosphere of part of the Medieval church, Protestantism has taken over the idea that sin is largely bound up with intense expression of the appetites. Biology, psychology, and so on, have told us in the meantime that these appetites are normal and healthy, and nothing to be afraid of. But this interpretation of sin has made the average person afraid of the ethics of the church, and religion has come to be thought of as a repressive thing, which a man should depend on for his general sentiments, but let severely alone as long as he wants to have a good time. We have identified religion with that moral struggle and ethical deliberation which Luther and Paul strove to escape by means of their religion. And in the meantime we have condemned least of all just that which from the Christian point of view is the greatest sin.

Let us go back for a moment to Anselm. Not having to adjust himself to two *milieus* like Paul and Luther, he had a less disturbed vision of the orderliness of God. It was so very clear to him that when a person got the idea of God as the ordered existence of everything in the world, wrong would drop out of his life overnight, and goodness become normal and easy. The experience came naturally to the men of his time through their unified politico-religious Holy Roman Empire, based on Christ. Hence sin was to him only

the reverse side of righteousness; in his thought of Atonement the important thing was to gain the righteousness that comes from concord with God, as shown to us in Jesus Christ.

One cannot help suggesting that life among the feudal slaves in Anselm's time may have been far happier than it is for most Americans today. The black spot of the older age is of course its failure to meet new ideas and situations; its glory is that within its medieval conceptions it gave men a unified God, philosophy, church, conscience, and pursuit of happiness—all these five items were just one. No wonder the priest in his confessional could easily weed wrong and unhappiness out of the lives of his child-minded parishioners. God had his chance in human lives; and the problem of human happiness, as such, never seems to have arisen at all. Their lives (through Christ and the church) were perfectly adjusted to the only God they knew.

Does this not give us much food for thought in facing the religious problem today? Men are confused, first, about whether or not the world *is* orderly (this is tantamount to saying, whether God does exist); second, whether, if it is orderly, that orderliness makes for the greatest happiness for man if followed; and third, if so, how to get that orderliness, or straightened point of view, into their own lives.

The answer to the first question is speedily being furnished, in the affirmative, by the very "materialistic" sciences of which we have been so much afraid, for they have found that everything in ordinary experience acts according to certain obtainable rules. The answer to the second question, about happiness, is given by the much berated evolutionary theory, which informs us that at any given time the accepted rules of living make in the main for the greatest happiness of the majority, or else men automatically inaugurate steps to change these rules; that is, that for any given set of outward conditions, animals and men tend to evolve the most agreeable ways of living within them. No moral, religious, social, or political practice long survives its power to contribute to human happiness.

But the answer to the third question, religion has always been called upon to give. This answer since the time of Paul has been stated variously in theories of Atonement through Christ. Since the modern approach is to get back to facts, let us go back, past Anselm, to Jesus himself, to see if Christianity can meet this modern situation at the point of this third question, how to make the conception of God useful for daily life. What Atonement can we actually find in the historical Jesus? With a brief suggestion of an answer to this question, this discussion will close.

The historical student, investigating the death of Jesus, is likely to see in it simply some outcome of the combination of Jesus' way of life with outer circumstances. So he may give up looking for the power of the Cross in Jesus' death (for the time being, at least) and search rather in the life that was there "lifted up." What was there unique in Jesus' life?

The Man of Nazareth seems to have found and exemplified the secret of being good, not by trying hard, but by so absorbing the idea of the way of God being the right way, that it came spontaneously into his own actions. Jesus was so convinced that God and righteousness and social and personal happiness were all one thing, that he automatically dropped from his life (assuming it was ever there) every thing that conflicted with this great unified ideal. Hence Jesus was, as far as we know, the most Godlike man, the most righteous man, the happiest man, and the most helpful man, that ever lived, and all at the same time. The first, second and fourth of these categories have been endlessly emphasized in doctrines of the divinity, the sinlessness, and the vicarious atonement, of our Lord. The one we seem completely to have forgotten is that all this also meant to Jesus the maximum of personal enjoyment of life. He discovered at first hand, and practiced, that the way to have the happiest possible life, is not to repress and struggle over the natural instincts, nor on the other hand to indulge them to excess, but to enjoy the instincts and appetites of life to the full, *except in any respect in which such enjoyment interferes with the ability of every body else also to enjoy them.* And when some such higher reason is found for not indulging an appetite, it is as easy and natural not to fulfill it as it is to satisfy it under normal conditions. Hence Jesus enjoyed the feasts of his day with an excellent appetite ("gluttonous and winebibber," they called him), but could with equal ease give up every physical exercise of the sexual function because he could prosecute his work more effectively without family ties. And the indulgence in the one case, and the denial in the other, were equally normal and easy, because both were in accord with the will of God and the common good of all men.

And that style of life, which Jesus carried out so spontaneously and fully, he invites us also to live. "Be ye followers of Me." That is the Atonement with God that he has given us. That is the core of what the writer of the Fourth Gospel, and Paul, and Augustine, and Anselm, and Luther, and the essayists in the present volume, are seeking to communicate in their various statements of the doctrine of the Atonement. That, and not the awfulness of sin, is what constitutes the "objective reality" of the Atonement which these writers so intuitively insist upon. And surely we are now in better position to see the value of the stress laid by Luther and others on sin. For sin is whatever stands in the way of this conception of Jesus that to be God-like, righteous, helpful, and *happy,* are one and the same thing. And today, great is our sin!

For we in America (and Europe), while clinging to our traditional faith, and seeking new ethical standards, have allowed ourselves to become convinced, as part of our outlook on life, that the real way to get the most out of life is to gratify our instinct for self-advancement, and try to get ahead of everybody else. While actually we are helpful in many respects (thanks to

the Spirit of God), our own real spirit of seeking happiness is to be the outstanding one of a crowd—to have a costlier car, a finer home, a larger fortune, a rarer brand of whiskey, a higher position, a wider influence, a greater fame, a bigger factory, office, or church building, than the rest of the world can have. And this is not because we are innately selfish (we prefer to be unselfish), but because we have the *secular* notion that the selfish, self-advancing person is the really happy one. We have lost the *religious* notion, the vision of God so utterly axiomatic to Jesus and Anselm, that the greatest joy is always found in the things in which the mass of mankind can share; in the fruits, not of cutthroat competition, but of coöperation and generous participation by all.

"Come unto Me," I think I hear Jesus still crying in 1930, "all you Americans who are working yourselves to death in order to make a living, and are worried sick for fear you will lose your business and social standing, and I will give you complete relief. Adopt My method of living for yourselves, and find out from Me My attitude toward the hard world of fact. For I never get angry or excited or afraid; but I approach every problem, whether of health or business or dealings with people, with an open mind, willing to profit by mistakes, and give others what is theirs. And you will find peace, contentment, and happiness for your lives. You will not feel repressed by any restrictions which I lay upon you, for they are only such as already appeal to your common sense; and the burden which you think afflicts followers of My method will entirely disappear, when you find renewed zest for life, and joy for yourself and every one else besides." (Cf. Mt. 11:28-30).

THEODORE K. FINCK

THE ATONEMENT AND THE SOCIAL PROCESS[1]

Dean Mathews has written much that is challenging—nothing more so than his present volume under the above title. Dean Mathews is one of those intense Christians who seriously dislikes to see his Master discredited by obsolete trappings. In this book he would lay aside much that is trite in the traditional doctrine of the Atonement and penetrate to its spiritual core, its dynamic force as he finds it in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. It is a clarion call to a profounder understanding of the Christian Way of Salvation.

This book is not exactly easy reading. Like Professor Whitehead's *Process and Reality,* it involves a very new metaphysics. And for this reason the reader must first learn to understand his thought-forms. The fixed concepts of the traditional logic are discarded for a new set that are charged with action, life. For him, just as for Whitehead, the universe is dynamic and, hence, everything is in process. He uses the term "pattern" where traditional

1 By Dean Shailer Mathews. New York: Macmillan Co., 1930. $2.00.

writers would use "concept." A "pattern" is the way an age describes a given experience. Naturally much goes into many patterns that the user of the pattern does not analyse with care.

The doctrine of the Atonement comes into use through the medium of the Roman theological metaphysics. Here God is conceived under the form of a magnified Roman Emperor. Our notions of sin, forgiveness, Atonement, punishment, law, grace, are all tinctured with the imperial pattern. As a result of the imperial pattern our pattern of Atonement has an objectivity about it that readily slips into divine arbitrariness, as in Calvinism. It likewise loses its ethical force by its abstraction from the subject. If I understand the Dean, he contends that the Jews failed to understand Jesus' plan of Salvation because with him it was a process, predominantly subjective, whilst their traditional pattern construed it as objective, institutional, and formal. Their inherited pattern was very natural to them, but it obscured the true Christ. We are still reading the New Testament under patterns made under the Roman tradition and as a result the Atonement has lost its ethical and spiritual force in an age which is no longer Roman in its spirit, nor in its modes of thought.

A paragraph from this scintillating book will convey this penetrating mode of analysis. "The breakdown of the orthodox conception of future punishment is complete. Only an illiterate mind can be terrorized by the fear of the devil and of hell which nerved Thomas à Kempis, Martin Luther, and Jonathan Edwards. For them sovereignty with its corollaries was an effective pattern. Hell was as vivid as a torture chamber of a feudal lord or a fire in a field of peat. Justification was as definite as an acquittal in a royal court" (p. 197).

The Dean contends that these mediaeval patterns do not belong in Jesus' teaching. Hence we need to study with a profounder penetration what Jesus did teach. "Only by reading back into the gospel records the thoughts of later centuries can any teaching of an atonement by the death of Jesus be found" (p. 42). "Christianity moved into a world which had identified the reconciliation of God and man with the offering of sacrifices" (p. 50). "Jesus endured death, the punishment of sin, not in the place of, but in companionship with men" (p. 53). "The interpretation of his death as sacrifice is therefore to be regarded as the utilization of a pattern rather than as a literal philosophy" (p. 55).

Jesus announced a kingdom where a spirit of brotherhood should prevail. The bringing of such kingdom to pass is a "social process." "When we therefore organize our conception of God by the use of our experience as persons, we are not outraging any intellectual respectability. We no more know gravitation and light than we know God. In both cases we interpret a force through our experience. Our chief obligation is to see that the pattern which we use in our interpretation is itself reputable and in accordance with

what we have discovered to be actual." "Man is organic, not mechanistic, in the universe..... A man must respond to other forces than the material. .... Religion is the attempt to utilize our experience as persons in setting up relations with these personality-producing forces" (p. 186).

The book is a strong appeal to deliver Jesus' teaching concerning Atonement from its mediaeval obscurantism, to the end that Jesus may become in our age what Jesus meant to be in all ages and to all ages, namely, the revelation that in the cosmic process as we know it there is Good Will. "Jesus becomes an exponent or revelation of the method of right relations with the personality-producing forces of the universe" (p. 203). "Through his experience men know God as through the experience of the scientist they know electrons" (p. 208).

To the reviewer, impressed as he is with the fact that there is a new metaphysics and a new theory of knowledge in the making, Dean Mathews has done a splendid piece of constructive thinking on the most vital problem of our religion. He has given us a draft of the doctrine of the Atonement which promises to go a long way in helping us to bring the spirit of Jesus back to our real religious problems. He would put the living Christ into the center of the social process as the inspirer, guide and finisher of that process.

C. F. Sanders

BRUNNER'S THEOLOGY OF CRISIS

I put this book[1] down, shocked, illumined, puzzled, benefited. I have found it as helpful as it is thwarting; as enjoyable as it is disturbing; as sensible as it is the near-ridiculous. The paradoxes which it has set going in my mind are but the reflection of its general thesis that "paradox is the essence of the Gospel" and of a genuinely Christian theology. There is in this book the strange mixture of conservatism and liberalism, rationalism and irrationalism, criticism and naivite, speculation and dogmatism. There is enough Calvinism in it to tickle the fancy of Calvinistic orthodoxy, enough Lutheranism to please Lutheran conservatism, and enough to embarrass both. There is sufficient philosophical insight to gratify the critically reflective mind and enough of the illogical to stir up a hot intellectual fever. There is the warmth of religious fervor in it to comfort the pious and at the same time there is the chill of irrationality to please any agnostic critic. To seek consistency in the point of view requires the closing of one's eyes to patent inconsistencies (especially the discussion of ethics); to expect it, is to miss the whole point entirely.

The development of modern thought is moving steadily and increasingly (since the beginning of the age of enlightenment) further away from a

1 *The Theology of Crisis.* By H. Emil Brunner. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929. 115 pages—index. $1.75.

genuinely *Christian* Christianity, so it is maintained. Tributaries of this current age of enlightenment are many, all of which represent either a perversion or denial of the religion of Jesus and the New Testament: monistic and idealistic optimism with its correlative doctrine of divine immanence; relativism; skepticism; naturalism; positivism; pragmatism; the presuppositions underlying modern science; mysticism; evolutionism ethical meliorism; rationalism, etc. Each of these trends comes in for a searching criticism; and let it be said that Brunner (the Melanchthonian interpreter of Barth) proves himself to be no mean critic. With bold and incisive sentences he brings into relief certain unavoidable implications which are caught up in the fast moving current of modern thought. In the judgment of this reviewer, the author is here at his best. He succeeds in illuminating much in the contemporary landscape. And the light that is shed plainly reveals one incontrovertible fact, viz., that modern thought and *traditional* Christian thought are, *as such,* incompatibles. The trumpet is sounded in these pages as an alarm; its call should not surprise anyone who has had any reasonable training in modern philosophical thought and traditional theology. What becomes of more significant interest, however, is *what* the prophet here tells us to think, as a way out.

Facing the solution of these incompatibles, Brunner does what many historic and contemporary Christian theologians have done: pronounces horrible invectives upon the current scene and then runs back under cover into the fastnesses of traditionalism. Instead of trying to resolve the difficulties through reinterpretations and readjustments, having faith that somehow there is something valuable in both the traditional and the contemporary, that neither is wholly faulty nor faultless, he recoils to the easier and less disturbing solution of retreat, preferring to defend a traditionalism even though it means a surrender to the paradoxical and the irrational. From an extreme left he swings to an extreme right; for him (as for the Barthians) there is no synthesis, only thesis and antithesis. Against monism (he has nothing to say about the contemporary pluralism) he sets up metaphysical dualism; against relativism, a dogmatic absolutism; against optimism, a full-rounded pessimism; against naturalism, supernaturalism; against ethical meliorism, total depravity and arbitrary election; against evolutionism, ingression; against immanence, complete transcendence; against social amelioration, an eschatological cataclysm; against reasonableness, paradox; against mysticism and rationalism, revelation; and so on. That much may be said in defense of the antitheses thus set up, is most evident to anyone who sees the inadequacies of the theses; what is so shocking and disturbing about the point of view is that no attempt whatever is made at a synthesis. In my judgment, the fault with this theology of crisis is just here: a worse is made to appear the beter of the bad.

The Barthian school, it would seem, is suggestive of a symptom: there is

need for an adequate reconciliation between current philosophical and theological thought and the Christian point of view; but it certainly offers none such. It is fearfully dangerous to construct a Christian theology on the basis of paradoxes, irrationalities, uncritical dogmatisms, and the like, especially in such a day as this; to do so is only to invite ultimate ruin. The Barthian interpretation of Christianity, traditional in its emphasis, is to be put under serious suspicion if it finds it necesary to construct what amounts to an absurd apologetic.

Perhaps, however, we may take a more appreciative and sympathetic attitude of this type of thought if we keep in mind its social setting: it is giving comfort to folks who have had every reason to become weary and sick at heart in the post-war developments of continental Europe. There is a psychology back of this theology.

VERGILIUS FERM

IS LITURGICAL UNIFORMITY DESIRABLE?

Value should have expression in appropriate form, and religion particularly, which is a profound part of human experience, should find expression through a well directed and trained liturgical attitude.

Dr. Strodach's *Manual of Worship*[1] gives interpretation and direction respecting our Lutheran Common Service Book, and seeks to inculcate a reverent spirit of worship.

Part I treats of the Sanctuary, Chancel, Sacristy, etc., the origin and nature of ecclesiastical furnishings in special detail.

Part II is a directory of Lutheran Liturgical Practice. The author wishes the book to be "informative and suggestive," to present a normal liturgical use apart from "personal view," a use that is neither "low church," nor "high church," but a "happy medium." To the reviewer, however, the personal equation does creep in, which is but natural in matters of churchly practice.

At the outset several established principles not mentioned by the author may be posited, which principles give a wider outlook for tolerance in the liturgical practice of worship. Divergence from some of the conclusions reached by the author may occur due to fuller history of the simplicity of worship practiced by the primitive church, a simplicity sought after in the Protestant Reformation.

The so-called Christian altar is not an Apostolic institution, but a priestly development several centuries subsequent to the Apostolic era. The primitive Christian meeting place for worship had no altar, and Christians were taunted by the pagans for this palpable lack. Origen in his discussion

1 *A Manual of Worship.* By Paul Zeller Strodach. Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1930. 237 pages. $2.50.

with Celsus, who states that Christians were forbidden to "raise altars," admits the charge and replies that "the altars are the heart of every Christian." The omission of the altar is also discussed by Lactantius, *De Origione Erroris,* II.2.

The communion was administered from a simple wooden movable *trapeza, mensa,* table.

When superstitious value became attached to Christian relics, these were placed on or under the communion table, and subsequently the sides of the table were boarded up to preserve the contained relics, giving the table an altar form. In the mediaeval age no altar might be consecrated unless it contained a relic, or relics.

After Cyprian planned episcopal order, clerical rank, and sacred offices for celebrants, a priesthood could not function well without an altar, which was introduced gradually by Roman practice. When the cathedral Sancta Sophia at Constantinople was converted into a mosque in the sixth century, it contained a simple communion table.

The ascent to the early Christian altar consisted of a simple *predella* on which the officiant stood. The seeming requirement of three steps from the sanctuary to the altar, and four steps from the nave to the sanctuary, not infrequently introduces the proportions of a cathedral into a chapel to the detriment of good architectural balance.

Dr. Strodach, p. 25, makes the altar supreme, declaring it "the chief and most important article of furniture" in the sanctuary, which is scarcely Lutheran teaching. The *word* makes the *sacrament,* how about the *pulpit?*

A simple historic approach to the subject, and a historical method of treatment would be more pleasing than a dogmatic or dictatorial tone. The terms, "of necessity," "should," "should not," "must," "must not," appear too frequently in the discussion of *diaphora.* Such an attitude is wont to provoke criticism, or even awaken controversy. A kindlier balance of probabilities would suggest more liberal conclusions, and awaken a more amicable spirit in the scholarly reader.

The author in his treatment of the Lord's Supper, p. 59, makes a rather ungrateful gesture at "science."

Pasteur's discovery of disease germs, with the establishing of the germ theory, is one of the greatest benefits to the human race. It has revolutionized surgery and the practice of medicine with the use of antiseptics and inoculations and saves annually unnumbered lives. Sanitation, dietetics, the rules of absolute cleanliness, have wrought untold benefits to humanity.

Dr. Strodach deprecates the use of individual communion cups, but recognizes the inevitable. He says, p. 60, peremptorily in italics: *"The individual cups should not be filled before the administration, nor should they be placed upon the altar in trays under any circumstances."*

At our Lord's institution of the sacrament there was the common loaf,

artos, as well as the common cup. Machine-made wafers placed in a ciborium and individual cups in trays are on a simple parity. Neither was the original *form* of administering the sacrament. It seems strange to the reviewer that several hundred wafers in a ciborium may be sacredly placed on the altar, while several hundred wine cups in a tray, similarly placed, would be an utter desecration, when an identical principle is involved.

If it be "perfectly proper" to administer wafers from a ciborium instead of a paten, it seems equally proper to the common reason to administer wine from a tray in individual wine cups. Wine cups in a tray are a simple equivalent of wafers in a ciborium.

Dr. Strodach pressingly urges what may be called the cafeteria method of administering the wine, that the communicant in transit receive from a deacon an empty cup, and carry it to the altar to be filled by the ministrant from a strangely devised chalice. *De gustibus non disputandum.* In this procedure the means of worship seem to become the worship of means. The author views with extreme caution any practice that does not have "ancient precedent," and seems to think that the era of Luther was the only appropriate time to break away from needless customs, and that modifications of method since Luther's day are rarely, if ever, justifiable.

A liturgical taste as refined and spiritual as an ancient one may supersede a practice inherently passing into obsolescence by reason of temporal inadequacy. A refined spiritual consciousness is not bound to forms; antiquity is not always sanctity in perpetuity. It is scarcely spiritual to affirm that we should train our religious life to fit some liturgical form which fails to convey spiritual satisfaction, rather than modify the form to be in keeping with a refined religious consciousness.

A desire for uniformity in worship may go to extremes and trespass upon a differing Lutheran consciousness. Shall standing, or kneeling, to receive holy communion be deemed the correct practice? Shall orientation be practiced to express a pure religious consciousness? Whose interpretation of a Lutheran religious consciousness shall be accepted? Shall the minister abandon the lectern and read the Epistle lesson from the north side of the altar, and the Gospel lesson from the south side? Shall the liturgical celebrant press the fourth and fifth fingers to the palm of his hand in imparting the benediction? Shall the sign of the cross at stated times be the expression of a pure religion?

For instance, in the early church the Scriptures were in the form of rolls or scrolls, and not one ambo, but at least two ambones were necessary to give placement to all the Scripture rolls. The Epistle ambo holding the epistles and music was adjacent to the choir; the Gospel ambo holding the gospel scrolls was movable, and became at length either a stationary or movable pulpit. Now what shall be done about it today with a complete one volume bound Bible and a Common Service Book containing full lessons for the

liturgical year; what shall be done to express a so-called Lutheran practice? It seems that it would be appropriate to sweep some of it away to effect a pure Protestant Lutheran Consciousness for the twentieth century; at least a toleration of differing practice would be a Christian attitude.

We should appreciate the value of appropriate liturgical order, and a becoming attitude in the expression of a worshipful spirit, but absolute uniformity in worship may not be demanded, and *adiaphora* should not become *the* distinguishing feature of a true Lutheranism.

If the minister does not have native common sense, spirituality of temperament, or instinctive cultural tendencies, he may read chapters IV, XV and XVII of Part I.

The author appends no Bibliography. The volume is well illustrated; seventy-five or more illustrations appear, objectifying church edifices and furnishings, and the habiliments of liturgical service.

The printer's art has fine execution in the quality and mechanical construction of the volume.

The Manual will be a valuable help to theological students, clergy, and interested lay people, in becoming acquainted with liturgical usages, and an incentive to further study and application of appropriate forms of worship.

M. Coover

DR. BERNARD'S COMMENTARY[1]

It is a matter of sincere regret that the late archbishop of Ireland, author of the International Critical Commentary on the Gospel According to St John, did not live to see his work through the press. But, fortunately, he had completed the manuscript of both volumes before he passed away, so that the work is entirely his own, with the exception of the general editing, for which Dr. McNeile, of Dublin, has been responsible, and the Indices which have been prepared by the Rev. R. M. Boyd. Both men deserve the thanks of the public for their painstaking labors.

The commentary itself consists of 714 pages of "Notes on the Greek Text," with occasional excursuses on special points. The notes are very full, and bear testimony to the author's accuracy in textual, linguistic and philological matter. Nothing has been left undone to elucidate the meaning of the text on the basis of all the available material which modern scholarship has brought to light. Ample use has also been made of the exegetical works of the past. With reference to the Patristic exegesis the author has found the writings of Ignatius, Justin and Irenaeus more valuable than any of the set

1 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John* (*The International Critical Commentary*). By Archbishop J. H. Bernard; edited by J. H. McNeile, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929. Vol. I, clxxxviii + 290 pages; Vol. II, pages 291-740.

commentaries of the Fathers. He has made no attempt to collect or collate the views of modern commentators, although he is sensible of his obligation to many of them. His opinion of recent exegetical works on the Gospel of John is expressed in the following statement: "During the last quarter of a century great commentaries on the Fourth Gospel, such as those of Brueckner, Meyer, Westcott, Godet, of former generations, have not been produced." In a footnote reference is made to Walter Bauer's commentary, "which is packed with scholarly comment, although it is not on a large scale." The author is perhaps right when he says that modern scholars "have devoted themselves rather to the historical and critical problems of the Gospel than to the exposition in detail of the text." But to me it is a painful omission that he refers nowhere to Zahn's great commentary on John, which first appeared in 1908 and of which the sixth edition was published in 1921. I do not know why Zahn's name has been omitted or why his commentary on John has been completely ignored by the author. This may be accidental, and one might let it go at that if it were not for the fact that it seems to be customary in certain circles to ignore the works of conservative theologians, not because of a lack of scholarship but because they do not bear the stamp of the school. Yet, *peccatur intra et extra muros.*

The exposition of the text is to a large extent influenced by the author's conception of the place and significance of the Gospel of John in the early Christian church and literature. Dr. Bernard has set forth his own views in their relation to the numerous critical and historical problems of the Gospel in an Introduction which covers nearly two hundred pages. This Introduction is, therefore, of unusual interest. The treatment of the questions involved is very full and exhaustive, and is characterized by a conservative tendency which stands in marked contrast to the radical views of many other modern scholars concerning the origin and historicity of the Fourth Gospel.

The conservative tendency of the author is already noticeable in the first chapter of the Introduction, which deals with the text and its dislocations. Dr. Bernard has rearranged certain passages which he believes have been misplaced. I have my doubts as to his judgment in transposing these passages and assigning them to what he thinks is their proper place in the Gospel. But I agree with his general principle that, "where manuscript evidence is wholly lacking, and internal evidence alone is available, hypotheses as to transposition of sections are necessarily precarious, and ought to be accepted only when the internal evidence is very strong."

The same constructive tendency can be noticed in the second chapter which gives a very full discussion of the question of authorship. Dr. Bernard believes that John the Apostle and the Beloved Disciple are one and the same person, that John the Apostle did not suffer death by martyrdom, that John the Apostle is the "witness" behind the Gospel, but that he is to be distinguished from John the Presbyter who was also a disciple of Jesus, although

not one of the Twelve, and that this second John is the evangelist who wrote the Gospel.

In the third chapter Dr. Bernard discusses "the characteristics of the Evangelist," his Jewish background, his literary methods, the prominence of the idea of "witness," and his relation to Philo. This chapter is perhaps less satisfactory than others. But it is again characterized by the same caution and conservatism which mark the author's general attitude to the critical and historical problems involved in modern discussions of the Fourth Gospel. For example, Dr. Bernard declines the theory that the evangelist is an allegorist who did not intend to present narratives of fact. He also declines the theory of literary dependence of the Fourth Gospel on Philo, although he admits that the evangelist "might have used the language of Philo on occasion when it suited his purpose."

The next chapter is devoted to a discussion of the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptics. Dr. Bernard has reached the conclusion that the evangelist "almost certainly" used Mark, that "most probably" he used Luke or, at least, source Q, but that he was not familiar with the Matthaean tradition as distinct from that of Mark. Of special interest is his explanation of the Discourses of Jesus in John and the words of Jesus in the Synoptics. His view of the Last Discourses is expressed in the following statement: "While the evangelist has left his mark upon the report of them, by arranging the sentences, by shortening them, by bringing together counsels which may have been repeated more than once, by using the Greek phrases and constructions with which he himself is specially familiar, the Teaching is not that of a pupil, however spiritually gifted, but that of the Master Himself, whose last words had been preserved in the memory of the Beloved Disciple, the last of the apostles."

The two chapters that follow are in my opinion the most important part of the whole Introduction, if not of the entire commentary. They deal with the Christology and the doctrinal teaching of the Fourth Gospel. Only a few points can be noted here. In the light of recent discussions, the Prologue with its doctrine of the Logos will perhaps claim the interest and attention of the reader more than any other point. Dr. Bernard's remarks on this point are both illuminating and satisfying. He declines, not only the connection of the Johannine Logos with the Logos of Philo, but also its association with the Mandaean and Hermetic literature. I may be permitted to quote a few sentences: "Many parallels to Johannine phraseology have been collected from the writings of Lidzbarski, Reitzenstein and others by Walter Bauer in the last edition of his commentary on the Fourth Gospel. Some of these are striking, especially those from the Mandaean Liturgies." "There is, however, no evidence that Mandaean teachings had any influence on Christian philosophy in its beginnings." "To build up community or similarity of doctrine upon coincidences of language between two writers is highly precarious;

and when the Johannine doctrine of the Logos is compared with that of Philo or the Stoics or the Sapiential Books, or even that of the Mandaean Liturgies, this should always be borne in mind." "Speculations about the Logos were current among Greek thinkers, and John does not stay to explain the term, which was in common use at the time. But he sets out, simply and without argument, what he believes the true doctrine to be; and he finds its origin in the Jewish teaching about the Word of God rather than in the theosophy of Greek Gnosticism. Its final justification is the Life and Person of Jesus Christ."

Another point of interest is the discussion of the Johannine miracles. Here the author is evidently somewhat embarrassed, and his own explanations are neither fully convincing nor completely satisfying. But we can fully agree with him when, in discussing the miracle of the raising of Lazarus, he says: "That Jesus could literally recall the dead to life is not impossible of credence by any one who believes that He Himself rose from the dead."

There are many points on which we disagree with the author, and some of these are of importance. But as a whole, Dr. Bernard's commentary on John is one of the very best which we have.

H. Offermann

NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS

As the Editorial Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke spends his days in reviewing other men's books, reading more than 1,000 volumes and manuscripts yearly. He has acquired the ability to see at once into the heart of a treatise, to grasp the essential argument and to pass verdict; not mere personal opinion, but judgment by fixed standards of modern thought and truth. The "fertility" of the modern mind in framing hypotheses is amazing, and leaves one in a state of bewilderment. It was Dr. Clarke's sympathy for the busy but "scholarly-minded clergyman" that led him to gather into a recent volume[1] a summary of the trend of modern New Testament critical study. The author has grouped some seventy works under twenty-three headings, stating the gist of the argument, weighing evidence, drawing conclusions, giving approval or pointing out weaknesses and contradictions. His purpose is not to sit in judgment on authorship, but to provide "orientation in the maze of modern views."

A discussion of the Virgin Birth occupies first place, with special reference to *The Greek Mystery Religions*, by Kittel, and *The Virgin Birth*, by Taylor; the former for parallels of birth-stories and the latter for literary criticism. Clarke finds in the Christian story "something new, not only in

1 *New Testament Problems.* By W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D. New York: Macmillan Company, 1929. 222 pages. $2.50.

its delicacy and reticence, but also in its content." Instead of a gradual evolution of the idea, he would prefer the theory of the secret tradition divulged during the weeks following the crucifixion, when the disciples were endeavoring to reshape their estimate of the person of Jesus in the light of his Lordship and the future kingdom. He holds it as not unreasonable to explain the silence of Mark and Paul as due to "a certain beauty of character" which would prompt a pondering of "these things in their hearts," rather than broad publicity. Hence the Virgin Birth "could not be expected to form a part of the public preaching." What we do find is a "Christology in every way congruous with the sacred mystery."

Three Markan texts receive interesting treatment. The first, Mk. 6:3, refers to the occupation of Jesus as "carpenter." The usage of the LXX would fix the meaning of "worker." That Jesus was a worker in wood, following Joseph's trade, was a matter of tradition, though St. Hilary refers to Joseph as a blacksmith. Unless qualified by some word of material, the "worker" may have been a builder. The author finds here new light on the building of the church and on the parables of business and responsibility. The Transfiguration, Mk. 9:4, is treated from the recent standpoint of psychic phenomena. Clarke suggests that the disciples "were able to enter into our Lord's consciousness and see with his eyes." Valuable deductions may follow: When faith fails, visions pass. In Mk. 10:13-16, the author prefers "boys" in place of the "babes" of Luke; and it was the boys, eagerly pressing forward, whom the disciples rebuked. "As a boy" becomes an accusative of form instead of a nominative of manner. The disciples fail to see the evidence of the kingdom in the eagerness of the boys for a blessing. Thus the story becomes more suitable for Confirmation than for Baptism. But we are left without comment on the picture of sturdy boys in the arms of Jesus. We shall have to think of him as seated, and the boys in his embrace.

A chapter on Christian and Greek miracle-stories investigates the parallels between the New Testament miracles and similar stories current in the heathen world. The author senses the fallacy of arbitrary selection "from the whole mass of pagan miracles," and consequent failure to study the pagan stories as a whole. A summary of such studies by Weinreich and by Reitzenstein is followed by the statement of the definite plan by which Jesus proposed to work miracles, as declared in the Temptation narrative: "Not for his own benefit nor to impose belief upon unwilling minds," but "to save others," as a part of his ministry. Thus, miracles were wrought with "limitations and under restraints imposed by his own will and by outward circumstances." In the light of the new theories of physics, the old idea of the uniformity of natural law can be maintained no longer, and will become about as obsolete as nineteenth century rationalism.

Six pages are given to a question raised by Professor Lake's book, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ;* namely, What became of the Lord's body?

Belief in the bodily resurrection dismisses this question. But belief in a living Lord, spiritually raised, leaves the body to be accounted for. Paul "received" certain testimonies from the church at Jerusalem. And we are forced by the preaching of the church to conclude that they "'believed in the empty tomb from the first." For the apostles' preaching could have been stopped at once by producing the dead body. If hate had prompted the removal of the body to the common pit, why keep silence about it? If the disciples moved it, is it likely "that these simple-minded provincials would have consistently maintained their position throughout a cross-examination" to which they were subjected? If the women were mistaken in identifying the tomb again, Joseph could have set them right. Or if he had reburied the body, a word from him would have cleared up the mystery. Dr. Clarke concludes that the body must have been moved by some one unknown, "neither friend nor enemy, actuated by motives so obscure that we cannot even hazard a guess at them." But this still leaves the question open. The only alternative is the tradition of the church.

These excerpts suffice to show the trend of the reviews. The liturgist will find a technical study of the Early History of the Eucharist; the historian an unusual reference to Penance and Confession to Laymen. For these hurried days, there is a timely reference to the "thorn" of Paul, including the suggestion that he may have been the victim of "nerves," with stammering as the outward manifestation. The final chapter attempts an answer to the question, May we expect a religious revival? The author believes that rhythm is a law of man's nature, and that we "cannot attend to more than one thing at once." From the analogy of history, he ventures the prophecy that our present highly scientific age will be succeeded by one supremely religious. While appreciative of modern progress, he beleives that I Cor. 13 has meant more to the world than all the discoveries of astronomy.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER

LOVE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT[1]

Creation is the producing of otherness. Redemption, salvation, is the conserving of that otherness; and otherness is the first step of love.

Philia is friendship, *philos,* a friend, but *agape* is love. Love is the basic principle of life and religion. God is ever going outside of himself for self-expression, and God is Love. The great ethically social principle of worthy being, of a good life, is love. A pure religion of ethical content centers in that which is elevating, refining, morally formative. Love is basic in Christianity, the determinative principle in the relationships of God and man.

Dr. Moffatt has given a very capable and stimulating discussion of this

1 By James Moffatt. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1930. xv + 333 pages. $3.00.

somewhat neglected theme in his historical and exegetical book, *Love in the New Testament.*

The emotional erotic element of human relationship is as old as the race of man, and paganism has full acquaintance with it; but *eros* is eliminated from the New Testament concept of love, and a higher principle, worthy of an ethical religion, finds expression in a love-language that is in keeping with life's nobler emotions and social values.

Dr. Moffatt divides his subject matter into three relationships: God's Love for Man; Man's Love for God; and Brotherly Love. There seems to be sufficient New Testament material for a division treating of God's Love for his Son, but the author has made this theme a brief subdivision of the Johannine interpretation of divine love, while the more meagre material on the Love of the Son for the Father has naturally but brief mention.

Under this threefold division are embraced all the New Testament sources, which are embodied under four heads: The Teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels; Paulinism; the Primitive Church; the Johannine Interpretation.

A valuable introduction precedes the detailed discussion of the subject. The author gives examples of the synonymous nature of the verbs, *philein,* and *agapan* in New Testament usage, and makes the two terms completely synonyms. To the reviewer, however, *agapan* seems to express the deeper values, and while *philein* may express many heart-attitudes which can be as well covered by *agapan,* yet *agapan* has a dignity of expression that can not always be conveyed by *philein.* The involuntary, spontaneous emotions and attitudes of the soul may be expressed in terms of both; but when the human will is called upon to act for volitional ends, when love is commanded as an exercise of the will to obedience, *agapan* is invariably employed; *agapan* seems to be the choiceful word for volitional reverence and esteem.

Dr. Moffatt covers a wide and interesting field of exegetical research, throwing sidelights on many important scripture passages. The reviewer is not always reconciled to some of the exegetical conclusions of the author, for instance, whose sins are covered by love in the declaration made in I Pet. 4:8, and cognate passages, pp. 240-242.

The reticence of Jesus in the use of love-language; the predilection of Paul for faith, trust, righteousness, in love-forms; the Johannine bounty of love-exhortations; the reserved attitude of Jesus' disciples and their scant use of love-terms addressed to God and Christ are some of the many interesting side glances at attitudes found in the New Testament.

Dr. Moffatt has given us in this volume a wealth of information and suggestion, and covers a field of valuable research. The volume is well indexed as to Subjects, Authors, and Scripture Passages.

M. Coover

THE SCEPTICAL BIOLOGIST[1]

The relation between science and religion has been discussed so much and so violently that one becomes wary at the sight of title, apologetic or review. Bigotry and bitter prejudice have been so common that it is refreshing to run across so calm and dispassionate a volume as this.

The author is a biochemist at Cambridge University. In spite of the adjective in the title which is a wordplay on Boyle's *Sceptical Chymist* of 1680, the author is a scientific thinker and he holds loyally to his science and scientific method. His book is an endeavor to establish the correct relation between science and religion, and, odd though it may seem at first glance, the scientific viewpoint he holds is that of mechanism. But his mechanism is not at all identical with the naturalism, scientific or otherwise, which has been ladled out to us in the past as accounting for either a world sufficient unto itself or with power sufficient to build life unaided. Factually he is a neo-mechanist. Biological vitalism he condemns. Organicism in biology is no more tenable than vitalism. Teleology, he maintains, has no place whatsoever in the calculations of the scientist. The type of mechanism, or the limited mechanism he holds, brings him to the conclusion that "materialism is no obstacle to the spiritual life." He grants perfect validity to the religious viewpoint and places both scientific and religious viewpoints on a level equality.

The first part of the book is given to essay chapters on the historical ground and background of his thesis. But the author is versed in the philosophies as well. Lotze gives him the cue for his major premise and Kant a goodly minor. From Lotze he maintains that mechanism is necessary as a process, a scientific methodology, but has no value in the ultimate finality. Kant he uses to bolster up a previous chapter to the effect that the scientific viewpoint and the religious viewpoint are our own optic glasses. Kant's "two sorts of causations are dependent for their existence on the peculiarities of ourselves, the apriority of the ways in which we think." On this basis he reduces both the scientific and the religious viewpoints, the "opposing, incompatible, and mutually destructive theories of the universe" to states of mind, to attitudes. He states: "The scientific frame of mind and the religious frame of mind are our frames of mind and not those of rival worlds." And as Kant was able to harmonize the incompatible mechanistic principles and teleological causations by subjectivating them, so the author subjectivates both scientific and religious viewpoints, the two incompatibles, into frames of mind, into attitudes, and harmonizes them into human character. Thus Lotze's mechanistic methodology, furnishing the scientific process, and Kant's subjectivation, taming down both science and religion, provide the solution to the problem of the conflict between science and religion.

The notice of the publishers states that Prof. Needham is a Catholic. One

1 By Joseph Needham. W. W. Norton & Co., 1930. 270 pages. $3.00.

wonders whether this in itself has not furnished a pair of strong optic glasses. "What can't be cured must be endured!" For he maintains that science and religion do not fit, they never have fitted and they never will fit because the scientific and the religious frames of mind are fundamentally antagonistic. They spring from deeply differing mental acts, they issue out of contradictory views of the universe, and at all stages are supremely uncongenial to one another. Yet in the business of living they must be taken together; not fused, for that is impossible; but incorporated into an harmonious human character. This strain, this tension, is the matrix out of which the character is born.

It is a fine plea. He does not rule out a creative, purposive, immanent God. He holds science and scientific fact, experiment and hypothesis. Science and religion shall agree to disagree and still be friends, respect one another, live amicably together, and their devotees be the stronger for the inner conflict in each breast where the battle must be fought.

Yet in spite of his commendable effort, his solution is no solution. Lotze's mechanistic methodology, restricted to scientific process alone as the author confines and describes it, may not be far from the truth. Let vitalists, organicists, mechanists and neo-mechanists solve this problem while physicists smile and theologians look on. Moreover, there has been entirely too much conflict between the misguided prophets of both science and religion, and the two frames of mind have been entirely too real. But to reduce the spheres represented by science and religion to attitudes, to frames of mind, and then to harmonize these two frames of mind which "'issue out of contradictory views of the universe" into an harmonious human character falls short of being a solution. It evades the pertinent question and does not satisfy knowledge. Teleology and finality may have no place in definite scientific process, but when Kant wanted to reconcile his various incompatibles he had to reach up to the supersensible and hitch his thinking to transcendental apperceptions. Any attempt to harmonize "metrical macrocosmic mechanism" with finality and teleology will have to do the same. At all events the harmonizing process will have to rise above mental subjectivation tendencies and apriority ways of thinking, and objectivate itself in something higher than human character, The co-ordination of knowledge and the unity of truth refuse to be subjectivated!

The book reads like a novel and is sprinkled with wit. The author has reached into the humanities and draws from many fountains. The book will prove to be a worthwhile addition to any thelological library.

CARROLL J. ROCKEY

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Red Harvest: The Poet's Cry for Peace. By Vincent Godfrey Burns. New York: Macmillan Co., 1930. 462 pages. $3.75.

The gripping introduction to this anthology of war verse tells us that the volume is a partial fulfilment of a vow to kill war,—a vow made in reaction to a vision of the devas-

tated grandeur of France's countryside, strengthened by the inhuman carnage of the war, and sealed with the home-coming of a brother,—"a shell-shocked, shattered husk of the gay young soldier who had enlisted and marched away."

Here, in a splendid literary collection from some two hundred and thirty pens, are to be found the best poems to which war has given rise. They are well arranged in fifteen groups, beginning with the voices that summon to battle, leading through the terrible tragedy and horror on to the vision of a new day of peace.

The editor, a young minister of Union Church, Palisade, N. J., is one of that large and ever significantly increasing host of men, both old and young, who, having tasted first hand of its horrors and its fruits, are shouting loudly that war is the very antithesis of Christ and humanity's best. For its effectiveness in driving home to us just that and ever reminding us lest we forget, this volume takes its place with the best war stories that have been written and the most realistic that the screen has produced in behalf of world brotherhood and peace.

D. F. PUTMAN

My Saviour. By Gerhard E. Lenski. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1930.

This little book, from the pen of one of our pastors, is a contribution to the Lenten literature of our church. In it the author aims to present a Lenten Devotional Manual for daily use. We believe he has accomplished his purpose, for all of the forty-seven meditations contained in the book strike a devotional note and reflect a Passion thought. These meditations are grouped around five main topics: His Saving Purpose; Men Whom He Could Not Save; Men Whom He Saved; The Infinite Cost of Salvation; Final Fruits of Salvation. It is not difficult to see how such a scheme, or plan, fits in with a study of the Passion of our Lord. Each meditation is preceded by a verse from Scripture, together with a suggested Bible reading, and is followed by a prayer. The meditations are brief and contain helpful and suggestive material. The book is a fresh and stimulating presentation, written in simple language and pleasing style.

In the Introduction the author well says: "Lent is a season which invites the meditative mood with the saving work of Jesus as the very natural object of its consideration. Great is the profit which comes to the faithful worshipper who heeds this invitation."

J. C. SEEGERS

The Heart of Words. By George Roberts. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929.

The book is true to its title. It's the study of words, and in this study the author goes to the heart of words. Two hundred words have been analyzed—studied etymologically—and the analysis gives the "underlying basic meaning" of the word.

From this inner meaning he studies the word in its relation to the thought of Scripture with which it is connected and deduces therefrom practical suggestions showing the practical significance of the word.

It is a valuable reference book. Your vocabulary will not be enlarged through its use, but it will most certainly be enriched. New shades of meaning will be gained and old words will take on fresh life. It will prove helpful—as every word study proves helpful—to the preacher in his sermonizing. In this particular it qualifies as "something new in homiletics." The expressed hope of the author in the brief preface seems capable of realization, namely, that "its ideas may be suggestive (from sub, under, and gerere, to bring) even to the extent of laying a foundation for larger thoughts and greater truths."

J. C. SEEGERS

The Psychology of Faith in the Individual. By Sylvester P. Juergens. New York: Macmillan Co.

A book by a Roman Catholic about a Roman Catholic, bearing the official stamp of approval of four high ecclesiastics in that branch of the church.

In order to write a discerning critical evaluation of the accuracy and comprehensiveness of this book one would have to be familiar with the voluminous writings of Cardinal Newman. The reviewer lacks that knowledge.

The author shows that Newman made a contribution to religious thought of his day. He also makes it clear that Newman has a contribution to make to religious thought in the twentieth century. He shows that Newman saw clearly that in the field of spiritual values man has knowledge that is not conceptually or perceptually grounded; he taught that in religion man is certain of the truth of religious experience simply because he has that experience. Then later this confidence may be rationally justified. Thus far Newman, and probably also the writer of this book, are on solid ground. But few if any of us will follow him in his interpretation of "Assent" or in his defense of the "Illative Sense." This is not justified by psychology or on any other ground.

Perhaps most Protestant readers will take most offense at his interpretation of faith as "Reliance on the word of another." In other words, faith is accepting something as true on the basis of authority. "Faith is properly an assent, an assent without doubt, or a certitude." It is the "submission of the intellect to mysteries." Newman's conception of the psychology of faith is also very inadequate.

You cannot read this book without stopping to think. One may disagree with much of it but he will profit from it.

S. G. HEFELBOWER

The Vestryman. A Handbook for Church Officers. By Rev. Calvin P. Swank. Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1930. 140 pages. $0.75.

This little volume of practical information, direction and guidance for the church officer should prove a very helpful promoter of better church methods and work. The name "Vestryman" is defended nicely and has somewhat in its favor. The book is tersely written, to the point and practical.

Perhaps too much is made of the appointment of the seven ministers in Acts 6, as the basis for the modern church officer. This should rather be looked upon as differentiation of the work of the church's ministry. See Blunt, *Acts of the Apostles,* p. 160: "This is therefore not the institution of a regular diaconate."

It might have been well at the expense of lengthening the work to add other features and methods of successful church administration. In the keeping of records for example, it is well to emphasize the value of keeping a record of "Unbaptized children," "Unconfirmed," "Out-of-town members," "Inactives," "Prospects" in such a way as to concentrate effort upon these classes. In transferring members from one church to another, it is well to give a complete record of the member: such as offices held, etc., and to include all members connected with such a member, baptized, and unbaptized children. Another efficient method of work is to head up each activity of the church in a "vestryman" so that the body of church officers is fully informed of every activity and plan of the church organizations. In many cases, of course, the vestryman is merely adviser to such activities or organizations. The church cabinet was also overlooked.

H. D. HOOVER